BEFORE THE CALIFORNIA INTEGRATED WASTE MANAGEMENT BOARD LOCAL ASSISTANCE AND PLANNING COMMITTEE

					/
COMMITTE	CE MEI	ETING)
LOC	AL AS	SISTAN	1CE	AND	PLANNING
)
IN 7	THE M	ATTER	OF	THE:)

DATE AND TIME: WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 15, 1997 9:30 A.M.

PLACE: BOARD HEARING ROOM

8800 CAL CENTER DRIVE SACRAMENTO,

CALIFORNIA

REPORTER: BETH C. DRAIN, RPR, CSR CERTIFICATE NO. 7152

BRS FILE NO.: 37294

APPEARANCES

MR. WESLEY CHESBRO, CHAIRMAN MR. ROBERT C. FRAZEE, MEMBER

MS. JANET GOTCH, MEMBER

STAFF PRESENT

MR. ELLIOT BLOCK, LEGAL COUNSEL

MS. KATHY MARSH, COMMITTEE SECRETARY

INDEX

PAGE_NO. ____

CALL TO ORDER AND EX PARTE COMMUNICATIONS

_ ----

- ITEM 1: REPORT FROM DIVERSION, PLANNING 7 AND LOCAL ASSISTANCE DIVISION
- ITEM 2: REPORT ON WASTE PREVENTION 17
 ACTIVITIES OF THE WASTE PREVENTION AND MARKET
 DEVELOPMENT DIVISION
- ITEM 3: CONSIDERATION OF CONSENT AGENDA: 22
- ITEM 5: CONSIDERATION OF STAFF RECOMMENDATION ON THE ADEQUACY OF THE HOUSEHOLD HAZARDOUS WASTE ELEMENT FOR THE CITY OF REEDLEY, FRESNO COUNTY.
- ITEM 6: CONSIDERATION OF STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS ON THE ADEQUACY OF THE SITING ELEMENT AND SUMMARY PLAN FOR FRESNO COUNTY.
- ITEM 7: CONSIDERATION OF STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS ON THE ADEQUACY OF THE NONDISPOSAL FACILITY ELEMENT FOR THE CITY OF EUREKA, HUMBOLDT COUNTY, AND THE SUMMARY PLAN FOR HUMBOLDT COUNTY.
- ITEM 8: CONSIDERATION OF STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS ON THE ADEQUACY OF THE HOUSEHOLD HAZARDOUS WASTE ELEMENT FOR THE CITY OF BRAWLEY, IMPERIAL COUNTY.
- ITEM 9: CONSIDERATION OF STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS ON THE ADEQUACY OF THE HOUSEHOLD HAZARDOUS WASTE ELEMENT FOR THE CITY OF CALEXICO, IMPERIAL COUNTY.
- ITEM 10: CONSIDERATION OF STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS ON THE ADEQUACY OF THE HOUSEHOLD HAZARDOUS WASTE ELEMENT FOR THE CITY OF HOLTVILLE, IMPERIAL COUNTY.

ITEM 11: CONSIDERATION OF STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS ON THE ADEQUACY OF THE HOUSEHOLD HAZARDOUS WASTE ELEMENT FOR THE CITY OF GARDENA, LOS ANGELES COUNTY.

ITEM 12: CONSIDERATION OF STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS ON THE ADEQUACY OF THE NONDISPOSAL FACILITY ELEMENT FOR THE CITY OF SAN DIMAS, LOS ANGELES COUNTY.

ITEM 13: CONSIDERATION OF STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS ON THE ADEQUACY OF THE NONDISPOSAL FACILITY ELEMENT FOR THE TOWN OF TRUCKEE, NEVADA COUNTY.

ITEM 14: CONSIDERATION OF STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS ON THE ADEQUACY OF THE AMENDMENT TO THE NONDISPOSAL FACILITY ELEMENT FOR NEW CITY OF LAKE FOREST, ORANGE COUNTY.

ITEM 15: CONSIDERATION OF STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS ON THE ADEQUACY OF THE AMENDMENT TO THE NONDISPOSAL FACILITY ELEMENT FOR THE COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO.

ITEM 16: CONSIDERATION OF STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS ON THE ADEQUACY OF THE HOUSEHOLD HAZARDOUS WASTE ELEMENT FOR THE CITY OF IMPERIAL BEACH, SAN DIEGO COUNTY.

ITEM 17: CONSIDERATION OF STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS ON THE ADEQUACY OF THE MULTIJURISDICTIONAL HOUSEHOLD HAZARDOUS WASTE ELEMENT FOR THE UNINCORPORATED AREA OF SHASTA COUNTY AND THE CITIES OF ANDERSON, REDDING, AND SHASTA LAKE.

ITEM 4: PRESENTATION OF A VIDEO DEVELOPED THROUGH A 1994/95 USED OIL RESEARCH AND DEMONSTRATION GRANT PROMOTING THE USE OF REREFINED OIL.

STAFF PRESENTATION
TESTIMONY
COMMITTEE DISCUSSION
ACTION

22 PUBLIC

24

ITEM 6: CONSIDERATION OF STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS ON THE ADEQUACY OF THE SITING ELEMENT AND SUMMARY PLAN FOR FRESNO COUNTY.

STAFF PRESENTATION	26
PUBLIC TESTIMONY	
COMMITTEE DISCUSSION	
λ CTT ON	29

ITEM 18: CONSIDERATION OF OPTIONS FOR GRANTING TIME EXTENSIONS FOR MEETING THE MANDATED DIVERSION GOALS OF THE INTEGRATED WASTE MANAGEMENT ACT OF 1989 FOR JURISDICTIONS WITH BOARD APPROVED SOURCE REDUCTION AND RECYCLING ELEMENTS

STAFF PRESENTATION	29
PUBLIC TESTIMONY	
COMMITTEE DISCUSSION	36
ACTION	46

ITEM 19: CONSIDERATION OF STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS ON THE ADEQUACY ON THE THREE-YEAR TIME EXTENSION FOR MEETING THE DIVERSION REQUIREMENTS OF THE INTEGRATED WASTE MANAGEMENT ACT OF 1989 FOR THE CITY OF LAKE FOREST, ORANGE COUNTY.

STAFF PRESENTATION	47
PUBLIC TESTIMONY	
COMMITTEE DISCUSSION	50
ACTION	52

ITEM 20: CONSIDERATION OF STAFF RECOMMENDATION ON THE FEASIBILITY STUDY OF COOPERATIVE MARKETING IN RURAL CALIFORNIA.

STAFF PRESENTATION	52
PUBLIC TESTIMONY	63
COMMITTEE DISCUSSION	62, 66 ACTION
	7.0

ITEM 21: CONSIDERATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS FOR CHANGES TO THE USED OIL RECYCLING BLOCK GRANTS.

STAFF PRESENTATION	71
PUBLIC TESTIMONY	76
COMMITTEE DISCUSSION	74, 77 ACTION
	8.0

ITEM 22: PRESENTATION OF RESULTS OF THE 1996 SCHOOL DISTRICT WASTE REDUCTION SURVEY REPORT.

STAFF PRESENTATION	81
PUBLIC TESTIMONY	
COMMITTEE DISCUSSION	86
ACTION	
ADJOURNMENT	88

1	SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA
2	WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 15, 1997
3	9:30 A.M.
4	
5	CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: MORNING. THE MEETING
6	OF THE LOCAL ASSISTANCE AND PLANNING COMMITTEE OF
7	THE CALIFORNIA INTEGRATED WASTE MANAGEMENT BOARD.
8	WE'LL BEGIN BY CALLING THE ROLL.
9	THE SECRETARY: COMMITTEE MEMBERS FRAZEE.
10	MEMBER FRAZEE: HERE.
11	THE SECRETARY: GOTCH.
12	MEMBER GOTCH: HERE.
13	THE SECRETARY: CHAIRMAN CHESBRO.
14	CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: HERE.
15	ARE THERE ANY EX PARTES THAT MEMBERS
16	OF THE COMMITTEE WOULD LIKE TO REPORT AT THIS
17	TIME?
18	MEMBER FRAZEE: NONE THIS MORNING.
19	MEMBER GOTCH: NONE FOR ME EITHER.
20	CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: OKAY. WE WILL BEGIN,
21	THEN, WITH AGENDA ITEM 1, WHICH IS THE ORAL REPORT
22	BY THE DEPUTY DIRECTOR FOR THE DIVERSION PLANNING
23	AND LOCAL ASSISTANCE DIVISION, WHICH WILL BE
24 25 CHAIRM	PRESENTED THIS MORNING BY LORRAINE VAN KEKERIX. MS. VAN KEKERIX: GOOD MORNING, AN

- 1 CHESBRO AND COMMITTEE MEMBERS. I'LL GET IT
- 2 STRAIGHT HERE. THIS IS AN UPDATE ON SOME OF THE
- 3 MAJOR ACTIVITIES WE HAVE GOING IN THE DIVERSION
- 4 PLANNING AND LOCAL ASSISTANCE DIVISION.
- 5 WE HAVE CONTINUED TO REVIEW LOCAL
- 6 PLANS, AND TODAY YOU HAVE ELEMENTS FOR 17
- 7 JURISDICTIONS ON THE AGENDA. THIS IS TEN
- 8 HOUSEHOLD HAZARDOUS WASTE ELEMENTS, FIVE
- 9 NONDISPOSAL FACILITY ELEMENTS, ONE SITING ELEMENT,
- 10 AND TWO SUMMARY PLANS.
- 11 THE DIVISION HAS BEEN OUITE BUSY IN
- 12 TERMS OF REGULATIONS. THE THREE RULEMAKING
- 13 PACKAGES FOR THE SOURCE REDUCTION/RECYCLING
- 14 ELEMENT CONTENT, NONDISPOSAL FACILITY ELEMENT
- 15 CONTENT, AND PROCEDURES FOR PREPARING THE PLANS
- 16 WERE DELIVERED TO THE OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE LAW
- 17 ON DECEMBER THE 31ST. THEY HAVE 30 WORKING DAYS
- 18 TO REVIEW THESE, SO WE EXPECT THAT THEY WILL BE
- 19 FINAL IN A VERY SHORT TIME.
- 20 THE WASTE CHARACTERIZATION AND
- 21 ANALYSIS BRANCH HAS PREPARED PROPOSED REGULATIONS
- 22 WHICH WOULD ADD OR AMEND FOUR ARTICLES IN THE
- 23 CALIFORNIA CODE OF REGULATIONS. THESE RELATE TO
- 24 SOLID WASTE PLANNING DEFINITIONS THAT ARE
- 25 CURRENTLY FOUND IN ARTICLE 3, MATERIAL TYPE

- 1 CLASSIFICATIONS WHICH ARE PROPOSED IN A NEW
- 2 ARTICLE 4, A METHOD FOR SOLID WASTE GENERATION
- 3 STUDIES WHICH IS CURRENTLY IN ARTICLE 6.1 AND
- 4 WOULD BE REVISED AND MOVED TO A NEW ARTICLE 5, AND
- 5 THE METHOD FOR DISPOSAL CHARACTERIZATION STUDIES.
- 6 THIS IS BASED ON WORK THAT WAS DEVELOPED IN THE
- 7 BOARD'S CHARACTERIZATION METHOD WORKING GROUP THAT
- 8 THE BOARD APPROVED THE BASIC METHOD, AND THIS
- 9 WOULD BE THE REGULATIONS TO IMPLEMENT THAT. AND
- 10 THAT'S IN A NEW ARTICLE 6.
- 11 THE WASTE CHARACTERIZATION
- 12 REGULATIONS WERE MAILED OUT AND AN INFORMAL
- 13 REGULATION REVIEW NOTICE WENT OUT TO ABOUT 1800
- 14 INTERESTED PARTIES IN MID-NOVEMBER. AND THERE
- 15 WERE TWO INFORMAL PUBLIC WORKSHOPS IN DECEMBER,
- 16 ONE IN IRVINE AND ONE IN BERKELEY, WHICH SOUGHT
- 17 COMMENTS THE ON PROPOSED DRAFT REGS.
- 18 THESE WORKSHOPS WERE VERY
- 19 CONSTRUCTIVE, AND THEY YIELDED GOOD COMMENTS AND
- 20 SUGGESTIONS. THE STAFF HAS REVISED THESE FOUR
- 21 SETS OF REGULATIONS BASED ON THE INPUT RECEIVED
- AT
- 22 WORKSHOPS AND ALSO SOME WRITTEN COMMENTS THAT

WERE

- 23 DELIVERED, AND WE'RE WORKING ON INITIATING THE
- 24 FORMAL RULEMAKING PROCESS PURSUANT TO THE

Please note: These transcripts are not individually reviewed and approved for accuracy.

25 ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURES ACT. STAFF ANTICIPATES

- 1 THAT THE PUBLIC NOTICE FOR THE OFFICIAL 45-DAY
- 2 COMMENT PERIOD WILL BE SENT OUT IN LATE JANUARY,
- 3 SO WE'RE MAKING GOOD PROGRESS ON THOSE REGS.
- 4 SOME OTHER PLANNING ISSUES THAT YOU
- 5 WOULD BE INTERESTED IN. STAFF IS COMPILING
- 6 INFORMATION ON JURISDICTIONS WHICH HAVE NOT
- 7 SUBMITTED SOURCE REDUCTION AND RECYCLING ELEMENTS,
- 8 NONDISPOSAL FACILITY ELEMENTS, AND HOUSEHOLD
- 9 HAZARDOUS WASTE ELEMENTS AND IS DEVELOPING
- 10 RECOMMENDATIONS ON BOARD ACTIONS CONSISTENT WITH
- 11 THE BOARD'S RECENTLY ADOPTED PLAN ADEQUACY
- 12 ENFORCEMENT POLICY.
- 13 WE ARE PREPARING AN AGENDA ITEM FOR
- 14 THE FEBRUARY PLANNING COMMITTEE MEETING, AND WE
- 15 HOPE TO HAVE A LISTING OF THOSE DOCUMENTS WHICH WE
- 16 DO NOT HAVE, EITHER THEY HAVE NOT BEEN SUBMITTED
- 17 OR THEY ARE INCOMPLETE, WITHIN THIS WEEK, AND
- 18 WE'LL MAKE SURE THAT ALL COMMITTEE MEMBERS HAVE A
- 19 LIST OF THOSE DOCUMENTS.
- 20 THE STAFF PREPARED A DISASTER PLAN
- 21 AGENDA ITEM FOR THE POLICY, RESEARCH, AND
- 22 TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE COMMITTEE'S JANUARY MEETING,
- 23 AND WE ANTICIPATE DISTRIBUTING THIS DISASTER PLAN
- 24 AFTER THE BOARD APPROVES IT LATER IN THE MONTH.
- 25 WE WILL BE MEETING WITH STAFF FROM

- 1 THE OFFICE OF EMERGENCY SERVICES AND THE
- 2 CALIFORNIA SPECIALIZED TRAINING INSTITUTE TO
- 3 DISCUSS DEVELOPMENT OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT WORKSHOPS
- 4 ON DISASTER DEBRIS MANAGEMENT, AND WE HOPE TO

HAVE

- 5 THOSE WORKSHOPS FOR LOCAL GOVERNMENTS SET UP IN
- 6 THE SPRING OF THIS YEAR.
- 7 CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: MAY I ASK A QUESTION
- 8 ABOUT THAT? NOT TO DIGRESS, BUT I'LL DIGRESS.
- 9 THOSE ARE SORT OF LONGER-TERM PLANNING --

DISASTER

- 10 PLANNING ACTIVITIES. WE MEANWHILE ARE AN ISLAND
- 11 IN THE MIDST OF QUITE A BIT OF DISASTER AROUND US
- 12 HERE IN THE VALLEY WITH THE FLOODING. WE'VE HAD
- 13 SEVERAL QUESTIONS, WHICH I KNOW YOUR DIVISION
- 14 RESPONDED TO, FROM LOCAL JURISDICTIONS ABOUT WHAT
- 15 EFFECT ON COUNTING THEIR DISPOSAL THE DISASTER
- 16 WILL HAVE.
- 17 AND JUST FOR THE RECORD, IT MIGHT

BE

- 18 NICE TO JUST HEAR A BRIEF LITTLE COMMENT ABOUT
- 19 THAT. AND THE THING -- I WAS HOPING THAT RALPH
- 20 WOULD BE HERE OR JUDY -- JUDY IS ILL, SO SHE WAS
- 21 UNABLE TO BE HERE. PERHAPS YOU CAN PASS ALONG

AND

22 WE CAN INITIATE A DISCUSSION ABOUT WHETHER OR NOT

- THERE'S ANY STEPS THAT WE COULD TAKE, EVEN THOUGH
- 24 LOCAL JURISDICTIONS HAVE A WAY TO AVOID BEING
- 25 PENALIZED FOR THE EXCESS WASTE THAT GOES INTO THE

- 1 LANDFILL, WHICH I WAS ASKING YOU TO COMMENT ON.
- 2 ALSO TRYING TO ENCOURAGE DIVERSION, AS MUCH
- 3 DIVERSION AS POSSIBLE OF DEBRIS AND MATERIALS AS
- 4 WE DID WITH THE NORTHRIDGE EARTHQUAKE.
- 5 AND SO I'D BE INTERESTED IN KNOWING
- 6 WHETHER THERE'S ANY STAFF DISCUSSION GOING ON AND
- 7 WHAT'S HAPPENING WITH THAT. WE DON'T NEED A
- 8 COMPLETE PRESENTATION ON THAT NOW. I'M JUST
- 9 RAISING IT FOR PURPOSES OF NOTING THE CONCERN AND
- 10 HOPING THAT WE'LL HAVE SOME DISCUSSION ABOUT THAT
- 11 AT SOME POINT.
- 12 MS. VAN KEKERIX: WELL, THE JURISDICTIONS
- 13 CAN SUBTRACT THE WASTE RESULTING FROM DISASTERS
- 14 FROM THE TONNAGE WHEN THEY'RE LOOKING AT
- 15 CALCULATING THEIR GOAL. THE BOARD STAFF WHO IS
- 16 THE COORDINATOR FOR THE BOARD'S DISASTER RESPONSE
- 17 IS LLOYD DILLON, WHO IS IN OUR DIVISION, AND I CAN
- 18 TELL YOU THAT LLOYD HAS BEEN EXTREMELY BUSY ALONG
- 19 WITH SEVERAL OF HIS STAFF.
- 20 WE HAVE PUT OUT ADVISORIES, COORDI-
- 21 NATED ADVISORIES WITH P&E DIVISION AS WELL. THERE
- 22 ARE ADVISORIES OUT REGARDING DIVERSION OF WASTES,
- 23 REGARDING DIVERSION OF HOUSEHOLD HAZARDOUS WASTES.
- 24 WE ARE PREPARING AN ADVISORY ON THE COUNTING
- 25 ISSUES, AND THAT SHOULD BE READY TO GO OUT VERY

- 1 SHORTLY. AND WE'VE BEEN COORDINATING WITH OTHER
- 2 AGENCIES THROUGH THE OES PROGRAM.
- 3 SO THERE'S BEEN CONSIDERABLE AMOUNT
- 4 OF WORK THAT THE STAFF HAS -- THAT THE WHOLE BOARD
- 5 HAS DONE IN RELATION TO THE DISASTERS THAT WE'VE
- 6 HAD WITH THE FLOODING HERE, AND WE HAVE BEEN
- 7 FOCUSING ON GETTING INFORMATION OUT TO PEOPLE ON
- 8 DIVERSION AND DIVERSION OPPORTUNITIES ON THE
- 9 COUNTING ISSUE.
- 10 CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: ALL THOSE THINGS SOUND
- 11 VERY HELPFUL. THE ONE THING THAT CAME TO MY MIND
- 12 WAS, IN THE CASE OF THE NORTHRIDGE EARTHQUAKE, I
- 13 UNDERSTAND WE WERE ABLE TO HAVE SOME INFLUENCE ON
- 14 FEMA. AND THE RESULT OF THAT WAS THAT SOME OF THE
- 15 EQUIPMENT THAT WAS PURCHASED FOR CLEANUP WAS, IN
- 16 FACT, EQUIPMENT FOR DIVERSION ACTIVITIES THAT
- 17 WOUND UP SIGNIFICANTLY STIMULATING THE C&D
- 18 RECYCLING INDUSTRY IN SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA AS THERE
- 19 WAS A SILVER LINING ON A CLOUD AS A POSITIVE SIDE
- 20 BENEFIT OF THE CLEANUP FROM THE EARTHQUAKE.
- 21 AND SO I'D BE INTERESTED IN KNOWING
- 22 THAT WE AT LEAST HAD LOOKED AT SIMILAR POSSIBILI-
- 23 TIES IN RELATION TO FLOOD DEBRIS. BUT THANK YOU.
- 24 WE DON'T NEED TO GO ON MUCH FURTHER THAN THAT
- 25 ALTHOUGH I WOULD BE INTERESTED IN GOING BACK AND

- 1 SIT DOWN AND TALK SOME MORE ABOUT SOME THESE
- 2 THINGS AT A LATER TIME.
- 3 MS. VAN KEKERIX: ALL RIGHT. STAFF IS
- 4 BEGINNING TO REVISE THE RURAL COOKBOOK WHICH
- 5 CONTAINS VARIOUS CASE STUDIES THAT ARE APPLICABLE
- 6 TO RURAL JURISDICTIONS. THIS REVISION WILL
- 7 CONTAIN MORE CALIFORNIA PROGRAMS AND WILL
- 8 INCORPORATE SUGGESTIONS THAT WERE RECEIVED ON THE
- 9 FIRST EDITION OF THE COOKBOOK. WE ARE PLANNING TO
- 10 BRING THAT BACK TO THIS COMMITTEE ONCE WE GET IT
- 11 COMPLETED.
- 12 IN THE AREA OF USED OIL AND
- 13 HOUSEHOLD HAZARDOUS WASTE, DURING THE MONTH OF
- 14 DECEMBER, 169 USED OIL COLLECTION CENTERS WERE
- 15 CERTIFIED, MOSTLY PEP BOYS AND PARTS USA; 73
- 16 CERTIFIED CENTERS WERE RECERTIFIED, 15 CENTERS
- 17 WITHDREW FROM THE PROGRAM, 22 CERTIFICATES
- 18 EXPIRED, SIX INDUSTRIAL GENERATORS WERE
- 19 REGISTERED, AND ONE CURBSIDE PROGRAM WAS
- 20 REGISTERED. SO THIS BRINGS THE TOTALS WITHIN

THE

- 21 USED OIL RECYCLING PROGRAM TO 2,161 CERTIFIED
- 22 CENTERS, 528 REGISTERED INDUSTRIAL GENERATORS,

69

23 REGISTERED CURBSIDE PROGRAMS, AND ONE REGISTERED

24 ELECTRIC UTILITY, FOR A TOTAL PROGRAM

PARTICIPANTS

25 OF 2,759. THE CERTIFICATIONS STAFF ALSO CONDUCTED

- 1 64 SITE VISITS DURING DECEMBER.
- 2 THE USED OIL CERTIFIED CENTERS
- 3 EFFORTS WILL BENEFIT FROM A NEW TEN-MINUTE VIDEO
- 4 ENTITLED "THE CENTER OF ATTENTION CALIFORNIA'S
- 5 USED OIL RECYCLING PROGRAM." THE PROMOTIONAL
- 6 VIDEO RESULTED FROM AN IAA CONTRACT WITH THE
- 7 DEPARTMENT OF WATER RESOURCES AND HIGHLIGHTS
- 8 CERTIFICATION BENEFITS TO BUSINESSES, THE PUBLIC,
- 9 AND THE ENVIRONMENT.
- 10 ON OCTOBER 26TH AND 27TH OF 1996,
- 11 THE DEPARTMENT OF WATER RESOURCES STAFF SHOT MUCH
- 12 OF THE FOOTAGE OF THE NEW VIDEO AT A SACRAMENTO
- 13 AREA CERTIFIED CENTER. BOARD STAFF WORKED CLOSELY
- 14 WITH THE STAFF OF WDR TO DEVELOP THE SCRIPT AND
- 15 PRODUCE THE VIDEO. THE NEW VIDEO INCLUDES STAFF
- 16 OF THE BOARD'S DIVERSION PLANNING AND LOCAL
- 17 ASSISTANCE DIVISION. FINAL EDITING WAS COMPLETED
- 18 LATE LAST MONTH, AND COPIES OF THE VIDEO WILL BE
- 19 AVAILABLE FOR DISTRIBUTION TO LOCAL GOVERNMENTS
- 20 AND INTERESTED PARTIES BY THE END OF JANUARY.
- 21 CERTIFIED CENTERS PROVIDE A
- 22 CONVENIENT LOCATION TO THE PUBLIC TO RECYCLE USED
- 23 LUBRICATING OIL FROM SERVICING THEIR VEHICLES.
- 24 IN THE AREA OF HOUSEHOLD HAZARDOUS
- 25 WASTE GRANTS, THE ADMINISTRATION COMMITTEE AND

- 1 BOARD APPROVED STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS FOR AWARDING
- 2 34 GRANTS FOR A TOTAL OF \$3 MILLION IN HOUSEHOLD
- 3 HAZARDOUS WASTE FUNDING FOR FISCAL YEAR '96-'97.
- 4 NINETY-SIX APPLICATIONS WERE RECEIVED FOR A TOTAL
- 5 REQUEST OF ALMOST \$9 MILLION.
- 6 THE HOUSEHOLD HAZARDOUS WASTE GRANT
- 7 STAFF WILL BE ATTENDING THE HOUSEHOLD HAZARDOUS
- 8 WASTE INFORMATION EXCHANGE BEING HELD AT THE
- 9 ASYLIMAR ON FEBRUARY 6TH AND 7TH OF THIS YEAR.
- 10 AND DURING THE MONTHS OF AUGUST AND
- 11 SEPTEMBER OF '96, FOUR USED OIL TRANSFER
- 12 FACILITIES AND FIVE USED OIL TRANSPORTERS WERE
- 13 INSPECTED BY DEPARTMENT OF TOXIC SUBSTANCES
- 14 CONTROL. THE INSPECTIONS WERE CONDUCTED PURSUANT
- 15 TO THE INTERAGENCY AGREEMENT BETWEEN TOXIC
- 16 SUBSTANCES AND THE BOARD.
- 17 IN THE AREA OF PUBLIC EDUCATION AND
- 18 PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION, DURING THE MONTH OF
- 19 DECEMBER, TWO NEW RECYCLING PROGRAMS WERE ADDED TO
- 20 THE STATE'S PROJECT RECYCLING PROGRAM. THE NUMBER
- 21 OF STATE FACILITIES WITH PROGRAMS IS CURRENTLY AT
- 22 1,284 SITES. THIS COMPARES TO 927 SITES A YEAR
- 23 AGO.
- 24 AND STAFF IN THIS BRANCH COMPLETED
- 25 REVISIONS OF THE IN-HOUSE POCKET RECYCLING GUIDE

- 1 AND HAS SENT IT TO MEMBERS OF THE BOARD'S WASTE
- 2 PREVENTION ACTION COMMITTEE FOR REVIEW. ONCE THE
- 3 REVISIONS HAVE BEEN REVIEWED AND ANY REVISIONS
- 4 MADE, IT WILL BE PLACED ON THE BOARDNET.
- 5 THAT CONCLUDES MY PRESENTATION. DO
- 6 YOU HAVE ANY QUESTIONS?
- 7 CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: OKAY. ARE THERE ANY
- 8 COMMITTEE MEMBERS WHO WERE POLITE ENOUGH TO HOLD
- 9 THEIR QUESTIONS TO THE END INSTEAD OF INTERRUPTING
- 10 LORRAINE? THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR REPORT AND
- 11 INDULGING ME WHEN I WENT AFIELD A LITTLE BIT.
- 12 NEXT I'LL CALL ON BILL ORR, WHO'S
- 13 GOING TO PRESENT THE ORAL REPORT FOR THE WASTE
- 14 PREVENTION AND MARKET DEVELOPMENT DIVISION.
- 15 MR. ORR: GOOD MORNING, MR. CHAIRMAN,
- 16 AND COMMITTEE MEMBERS. I'M GOING TO REPORT ON A
- 17 FEW ITEMS AND FOLLOW UP ON ONE ITEM THAT WAS
- 18 MENTIONED IN REGARD TO THE DISASTER RESPONSE.
- 19 THE FIRST ONE IS A BRIEF MENTION OF
- 20 A MEETING THAT WAS HELD REGARDING THE RIGID
- 21 PLASTIC PACKAGING CONTAINER PROGRAM. STAFF MET ON
- 22 JANUARY 8TH WITH PEOPLE THAT ARE INTERESTED IN
- 23 COMMENTING ON THE WORK BEING DONE TO DEVELOP A
- 24 MORE COST-EFFICIENT METHODOLOGY FOR CALCULATING
- 25 THE 1996 ALL-CONTAINER RPPC RATE. THE GROUP

- 1 INDICATED THE DESIRE TO MEET AGAIN TO DISCUSS THE
- 2 CASCADIA REPORT, AND STAFF WILL KEEP THE COMMITTEE
- 3 INFORMED OF THE PROGRESS OF THE GROUP.
- 4 I'M PLEASED TO REPORT MAJOR STRIDES
- 5 IN DEVELOPING OUR SPRING 1997 GRASSCYCLING
- 6 CAMPAIGN. DISTRIBUTION PLANS FOR THE 1997
- 7 CAMPAIGN ALREADY INCLUDE ALL OF THE CALIFORNIA
- 8 WAL-MART, ACE, TRUE VALUE, AND ORCHARD HARDWARE
- 9 SUPPLY STORES. TO DATE THIS REPRESENTS MORE THAN
- 10 1200 STORE PLACEMENTS OF THE POSTER AND
- 11 GRASSCYCLING BROCHURE. STAFF IS NOW WORKING WITH
- 12 TARGET, HOME BASE AND HOME DEPOT TO SECURE
- 13 ADDITIONAL OUTLETS FOR THE CAMPAIGN. AND THAT
- 14 WE'VE SHOWN YOU THE "MY NEIGHBORS ARE GREEN WITH
- 15 ENVY" POSTER, SORT OF THE CENTERPIECE OF THE
- 16 DISPLAY ALONG WITH THE BROCHURES.
- 17 A NEW FEATURE OF THIS YEAR'S
- 18 CAMPAIGN IS TARGETED AT THE PROFESSIONAL LANDSCAPE
- 19 INDUSTRY WHOLESALE SUPPLY CENTERS STATEWIDE.
- 20 ADDITIONALLY, SIX MORE INDUSTRY PARTNERS WILL
- 21 DISTRIBUTE POSTERS TO THEIR RETAIL STORES AS WELL.
- 22 I'M ALSO PLEASED TO REPORT THAT WE
- 23 HAVE A NEW PART OF THE OFFICE PAPER REDUCTION
- 24 CAMPAIGN CURRENTLY ON THE BOARD'S INTERNET SITE.
- 25 IF YOU LOOK AT YOUR MONITOR, YOU CAN SEE A

- 1 COLLECTION OF ARTWORK THAT WAS DEVELOPED AS PART
- 2 OF THAT. AND I DON'T EXPECT YOU TO BE ABLE TO
- 3 READ THAT. BUT IT'S A NEW SUBJECT AREA WITHIN THE
- 4 EXISTING WASTE REDUCTION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM. THE
- 5 NEW OFFICE PAPER EFFORT PROVIDES BUSINESSES AND
- 6 LOCAL GOVERNMENT TOOLS TO CREATE THEIR OWN
- 7 CAMPAIGNS. AND WHAT YOU'RE SEEING HERE ARE SOME
- 8 OF THE SELECTED FULL-SIZE POSTERS FROM THE OVERALL
- 9 COLLECTION THAT'S ON THE DISPLAY THERE.
- 10 BASICALLY THE IDEA IS TO STIMULATE
- 11 THE ESTABLISHMENT OF OFFICE WASTE REDUCTION,
- 12 RECYCLING, AND BUY RECYCLED EFFORTS. AND THE
- 13 MEANS FOR THIS IS TO ACCOUNT FOR SAVINGS THROUGH
- 14 RESOURCE EFFICIENCY. DOWNLOADABLE TOOLS INCLUDE
- 15 ORIGINAL ARTWORK, SOME OF WHICH YOU SEE THERE THAT
- 16 WAS DEVELOPED BY THE BOARD'S GRAPHIC -- THOMAS
- 17 GONSALES. ALSO UTILIZES SOME OF THE PREVIOUSLY
- 18 DEVELOPED CLIP ART THAT'S BEEN AVAILABLE ON THE
- 19 WEB FOR SOME TIME WITH NEW COLOR AND SLOGANS TO GO
- 20 ALONG WITH THAT. ALSO INCLUDES THE BOARD'S OWN
- 21 IN-HOUSE CASE STUDY, DIRECTORIES OF SERVICE
- 22 PROVIDERS, AS WELL AS STEP-BY-STEP GUIDANCE IN
- 23 SETTING UP OFFICE WASTE REDUCTION PROGRAMS.
- 24 CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: HOW TO FILL A LANDFILL
- 25 FILE. THAT'S PRETTY GOOD. FILING CABINET THERE.

- 1 MR. ORR: FINALLY, AS JUST A FOLLOW-UP IN
- 2 REGARD TO THE DISASTER ADVISORIES AND SO FORTH,
- 3 THE C&D STAFF HAVE CONTRIBUTED INFORMATION THAT
- 4 WAS INCLUDED IN THE ADVISORY THAT LORRAINE
- 5 MENTIONED. WE'VE ALSO BEEN TRYING TO FOLLOW UP ON
- 6 SOME OF THE PROBLEMATIC AREAS THAT ARE SOMEWHAT
- 7 DIFFERENT THAN EARTHQUAKE RELATED DEBRIS; NAMELY,
- 8 IN REGARD TO THE WET CARPETING THAT'S BEING PULLED
- 9 OUT OF VARIOUS HOMES AND BUSINESSES.
- 10 IN STAFF LOOKING INTO THAT, WE WERE
- 11 HOPING THAT WE COULD FIND MORE INFORMATION ON HOW
- 12 THE CARPET COULD BE REFURBISHED OR RECLAIMED OR
- 13 USED FOR SOME OTHER PURPOSE. AND WE'RE FINDING
- 14 THAT CONCERNS ABOUT PATHOGENS AND SO FORTH IN THE
- 15 CARPETING FROM THE FLOOD WATERS, ALONG WITH THE
- 16 RELUCTANCE BY THE NORMAL RECYCLERS BECAUSE OF THE
- 17 ADDITIONAL WEIGHT BECAUSE THE CARPET IS WET, THAT
- 18 MEAN THERE PROBABLY ARE NOT A LOT OF RECYCLING
- 19 OPPORTUNITIES FOR THE WET CARPETING.
- 20 SO WE'VE SORT OF BEEN LOOKING AT
- 21 EMPHASIZING THE INCORPORATION OF BUY RECYCLED
- 22 PRODUCTS AS PEOPLE BEGIN THE REBUILDING PROCESS,
- 23 WHICH ISN'T QUITE AS TIME SENSITIVE AS GETTING RID
- 24 OF THE DISASTER MATERIALS. I THINK THAT'S WHERE
- 25 THE FOCUS OF OUR EFFORT IS GOING TO BE AT LEAST IN

- 1 THE NEAR TERM.
- 2 CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: THE THING THAT CAME TO
- 3 MY MIND AS I'VE SEEN PILES OF DEBRIS IS WOOD FROM
- 4 DOWNED TREES AND PLANTS AND FENCES AND OTHER
- 5 THINGS THAT HAVE BEEN WASHED BY THE WATER OR BLOWN
- 6 OVER OR WASHED OVER OR WHATEVER. YOU SEE A LOT OF
- 7 WOOD AROUND. I RECOGNIZE THAT SOME OF IT, IF IT'S
- 8 FROM DEMOLITION, HAS PROBLEMS. BUT HAS THERE BEEN
- 9 ANY EXAMINATION OF THAT MATERIAL?
- 10 MR. ORR: I DON'T THINK WE FOCUSED ON
- 11 THAT AS MUCH. I THINK THAT THERE IS MORE OF AN
- 12 INFRASTRUCTURE TO THE EXTENT IT'S AVAILABLE IN
- 13 THOSE AREAS TO PROCESS WOOD, AND -- BUT I DON'T
- 14 THINK WE FOCUSED ON THAT ONE AT THIS POINT.
- 15 SO THAT CONCLUDES MY REPORT. IF
- 16 THERE ANY QUESTIONS, I'D BE GLAD TO ANSWER THEM.
- 17 CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: ANY OTHER QUESTIONS?
- 18 MEMBER GOTCH: NO QUESTIONS.
- 19 CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: THANKS VERY MUCH.
- 20 AGENDA ITEM 3 IS CONSIDERATION OF THE CONSENT
- 21 AGENDA. THERE ARE COPIES AT THE BACK OF THE
- ROOM.
- 22 I FAILED TO MENTION THAT AT THE BEGINNING OF
- THE
- 23 MEETING. IF THERE'S ANYBODY THAT HASN'T SEEN
- IT,

NOW'S YOUR OPPORTUNITY, AND WE DO ENTERTAIN
EQUESTS TO PULL ITEMS OFF THE AGENDA IF THERE
ARE

- 1 INTERESTED PARTIES THAT WOULD LIKE TO COMMENT.
- THE CONSENT AGENDA IS ITEM 5, THE
- 3 SITING ELEMENT FOR ITEM 6, AND ITEMS 7 THROUGH 17;
- 4 IS THAT CORRECT? ANY WITHDRAWALS FROM THAT OR
- 5 MODIFICATIONS? IF NOT, I'LL ENTERTAIN A MOTION TO
- 6 APPROVE THE CONSENT AGENDA AND FORWARD IT TO THE
- 7 BOARD'S CONSENT AGENDA.
- 8 MEMBER FRAZEE: SO MOVED.
- 9 MEMBER GOTCH: SECONDED.
- 10 CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: IT'S BEEN MOVED AND
- 11 SECONDED. CALL THE ROLL, PLEASE.
- 12 THE SECRETARY: COMMITTEE MEMBERS FRAZEE.
- 13 MEMBER FRAZEE: AYE.
- 14 THE SECRETARY: GOTCH.
- 15 MEMBER GOTCH: AYE.
- 16 THE SECRETARY: CHAIRMAN CHESBRO.
- 17 CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: AYE. AND HUMBOLDT
- 18 COUNTY FINALLY HAS ITS SUMMARY PLAN DONE.
- 19 ITEM 4 IS A PRESENTATION OF A VIDEO
- 20 DEVELOPED THROUGH A 1994-95 USED OIL RESEARCH AND
- 21 DEMONSTRATION GRANT PROMOTING THE USE OF REREFINED
- 22 OIL.
- 23 MS. VAN KEKERIX: NORA KEENAN FROM THE
- 24 STAFF IS GOING TO BE PRESENTING THIS. I'M SORRY I
- 25 DON'T HAVE INFORMATION. I HAD MORE NOTES. LOOKS

- 1 LIKE I LEFT THEM. I'LL LET NORA GIVE YOU A LITTLE
- 2 BACKGROUND ON THIS.
- 3 MS. KEENAN: GOOD MORNING. MY NAME IS
- 4 NORA KEENAN. I'M WITH THE DIVISION OF PLANNING
- 5 AND LOCAL ASSISTANCE DIVISION IN THE USED OIL AND
- 6 HHW GRANT PROGRAM. I'M HERE THIS MORNING TO
- 7 PRESENT AGENDA ITEM NO. 4, PRESENTATION OF A VIDEO
- 8 DEVELOPED THROUGH A 1995 USED OIL RESEARCH AND
- 9 DEMONSTRATION GRANT BY THE COMMUNITY ENVIRONMENTAL
- 10 COUNCIL OF SANTA BARBARA.
- 11 THIS VIDEO WAS DEVELOPED AS PART OF
- 12 A WORKSHOP PROGRAM TO FLEET MANAGERS AND MECHANICS
- 13 TO PROMOTE THE USE OF REREFINED OIL IN THEIR
- 14 FLEETS. THE VIDEO DEBUNKS FIVE MYTHS ABOUT
- 15 REREFINED OIL: 1, THAT NO ONE USES IT; 2, THAT
- 16 IT'S TOO EXPENSIVE; 3, IT'S CONTAMINATED; 4, IT
- 17 WILL RUIN THEIR ENGINES; AND, 5, THAT IT WILL VOID
- 18 THE MANUFACTURER'S WARRANTIES.
- 19 TO DATE THE VIDEO HAS BEEN SHOWN IN
- 20 WORKSHOPS THROUGHOUT THE STATE, AND THESE
- 21 WORKSHOPS ARE PLANNED TO CONTINUE THROUGH APRIL.
- 22 TODAY WE ARE LUCKY TO HAVE JILL
- 23 ZACHARY FROM THE COMMUNITY ENVIRONMENTAL COUNCIL
- 24 HERE TO ANSWER ANY QUESTIONS THE COMMITTEE MAY
- 25 HAVE REGARDING THE WORKSHOPS OR THE VIDEO ITSELF.

- 1 THE VIDEO IS 15 MINUTES LONG, AND I WOULD LIKE ANY
- 2 OUESTIONS BE DEFERRED TILL AFTER THE VIDEO IS
- 3 SHOWN.
- 4 CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: APOLOGIZE FOR MY
- 5 RUDENESS IN TURNING THE MONITOR AROUND, BUT THESE
- 6 CUTE LITTLE MONITORS WE HAVE UP HERE ARE BASICALLY
- 7 WORTHLESS. SO IF ANY OF YOU CAN'T SEE, I WOULD
- 8 ENCOURAGE YOU TO GO OVER TO THE SIDE WHERE THERE'S
- 9 TWO OF THEM SO YOU CAN SEE. BUT IF WE'RE GOING TO
- 10 SEE IT, WE NEED TO HAVE ONE OF THOSE TURNED
- 11 AROUND.
- 12 SO ANY QUESTIONS AT THIS POINT?
- 13 OKAY. WE'LL PROCEED.
- 14 (THE VIDEO WAS THEN SHOWN.)
- 15 MS. KEENAN: DOES THE COMMITTEE HAVE ANY
- 16 QUESTIONS FOR EITHER MYSELF OR JILL?
- 17 MEMBER GOTCH: I DON'T HAVE ANY
- 18 QUESTIONS. IT'S A GREAT VIDEO.
- 19 CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: VERY WELL DONE AND
- 20 REALLY UNIQUE. I'VE SEEN A LOT OF THESE THINGS,
- 21 BUT THIS ONE REALLY STANDS OUT AS, I THINK, BEING
- 22 AN EXCELLENT VEHICLE FOR DELIVERING THE MESSAGE.
- 23 NOT JUST ONE, BUT ANSWERING THE QUESTIONS.
- 24 I'M INTERESTED IN WHAT KIND OF
- 25 RESPONSE WE'VE GOTTEN SINCE APPARENTLY IT HAS BEEN

- 1 OUT THERE NOW IN WORKSHOPS AND OTHER SETTINGS.
- 2 MS. KEENAN: JILL, WOULD YOU BE ABLE TO
- 3 COME UP AND ANSWER THAT OUESTION?
- 4 MS. ZACHARY: ACTUALLY WHEN WE FIRST
- 5 DEVELOPED THE WORK PLAN FOR THIS PROJECT, WE PUT
- 6 IN FOR 20 COPIES OF THE VIDEO. AND ONCE WE DID
- 7 THE VIDEO AND STARTED SHOWING IT, THERE WAS JUST A
- 8 HUGE AMOUNT OF DESIRE TO HAVE IT. WE'VE DONE
- 9 ABOUT 12 WORKSHOPS AND ABOUT SIX OR SEVEN MEETINGS
- 10 WITH FLEET MANAGERS AND MECHANICS USING THE VIDEO.
- 11 AND IT'S A GREAT TOOL. IT'S SERVED A GREAT TOOL
- 12 JUST TO BRIDGE FROM TALKING ABOUT REREFINED OIL TO
- 13 A FLEET MANAGER, FROM SORT OF THE RECYCLING
- 14 PERSPECTIVE TO THE FLEET MANAGER PERSPECTIVE. AND
- 15 WE HAVE PROBABLY 20 MORE WORKSHOPS TO DO IN THE
- 16 NEXT THREE MONTHS.
- 17 CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: SO I ASSUME THE
- 18 EXPENSIVE PART OF PRODUCING THE VIDEO IS ALREADY
- 19 BEHIND US SO THAT THE COST OF MAKING MORE COPIES
- 20 IS PROBABLY FAIRLY MINIMAL, I WOULD HOPE.
- MS. ZACHARY: YES, IT'S FAIRLY
- 22 INEXPENSIVE.
- 23 CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: SO ARE WE ACHIEVING
- 24 THAT, BEING ABLE TO GET MORE SO THAT WE CAN USE IT
- 25 TO TTS MAXIMUM?

- 1 MS. ZACHARY: THAT ACTUALLY HAPPENED.
- 2 MS. KEENAN: THROUGH AN EXISTING CONTRACT
- 3 WITH THE DEPARTMENT OF WATER RESOURCES, WE HAD
- 4 APPROXIMATELY 400 COPIES, I BELIEVE, MADE, THE
- 5 MAJORITY OF WHICH WENT TO THE MARKET DEVELOPMENT
- 6 DIVISION. JIM ROBINSON HAS THOSE COPIES. THE
- 7 BALANCE WAS SPLIT BETWEEN OUR RECYCLING PROGRAM
- 8 AND JILL TO DISTRIBUTE AT HER WORKSHOPS.
- 9 CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: GREAT. ANY OTHER
- 10 COMMENTS OR QUESTIONS? GOOD WORK. THANKS FOR
- 11 SHARING IT WITH US AND BRINGING -- KEEPING US UP
- 12 TO SPEED.
- MOVING BACK TO THE AGENDA, THE NEXT
- 14 ITEM IS ITEM 6, CONSIDERATION OF STAFF RECOMMEN-
- 15 DATIONS FOR THE ADEQUACY OF THE SUMMARY PLAN FOR
- 16 THE COUNTY OF FRESNO.
- 17 MS. VAN KEKERIX: TABETHA WILLMON WILL BE
- 18 MAKING THE PRESENTATION FOR STAFF.
- 19 MS. WILLMON: GOOD MORNING, CHAIRMAN
- 20 CHESBRO AND COMMITTEE MEMBERS. THE FOLLOWING IS A
- 21 BRIEF OVERVIEW OF STAFF'S REVIEW OF THE SUMMARY
- 22 PLAN FOR FRESNO COUNTY. CALIFORNIA'S PUBLIC
- 23 RESOURCES CODE REQUIRES EACH COUNTY TO PREPARE A
- 24 COUNTYWIDE INTEGRATED WASTE MANAGEMENT SUMMARY
- 25 PLAN. THE REQUIRED PLAN INCLUDES A SUMMARY OF THE

- 1 SIGNIFICANT WASTE MANAGEMENT ISSUES FACING THE
- 2 COUNTY AND THE CITIES WITHIN THE COUNTY. THE PLAN
- 3 IS ALSO REOUIRED TO PROVIDE AN OVERVIEW OF THE
- 4 SPECIFIC STEPS THAT WILL BE TAKEN BY LOCAL
- 5 AGENCIES ACTING INDEPENDENTLY AND IN CONCERT TO
- 6 MEET THE DIVERSION REQUIREMENTS OF AB 939.
- 7 FURTHERMORE, THE SUMMARY PLAN IS
- 8 REQUIRED TO CONTAIN A STATEMENT OF GOALS AND
- 9 OBJECTIVES SET FORTH BY THE COUNTYWIDE TASK FORCE.
- 10 THE FRESNO COUNTY WASTE MANAGEMENT DEPARTMENT IS
- 11 ACTING AS THE LEAD IN PREPARING THE SUMMARY PLAN.
- 12 THE PLAN COVERS THE UNINCORPORATED COUNTY AND THE
- 13 CITIES OF CLOVIS, COALINGA, FIREBAUGH, FOWLER,
- 14 FRESNO, HURON, KERMAN, KINGSBURG, MENDOTA, ORANGE
- 15 COVE, PARLIER, REEDLEY, SAN JOAQUIN, SANGER, AND
- 16 SELMA.
- 17 STAFF HAVE REVIEWED THE SUMMARY PLAN
- 18 FOR FRESNO COUNTY AND FOUND IT TO MEET ALL
- 19 STATUTORY AND REGULATORY REQUIREMENTS; HOWEVER,
- 20 THE BOARD HAS NOT YET ACTED ON SEVERAL OF THE
- 21 DOCUMENTS FOR SOME OF THE CITIES WITHIN FRESNO
- 22 COUNTY, SPECIFICALLY THE SRRE, HHWE, AND NDFE

FOR

23 THE CITY OF ORANGE COVE, THE NDFE FOR THE CITY

OF

FOWLER, THE HHWE'S FOR CLOVIS, SAN JOAQUIN,

25 SANGER, AND SELMA. THEREFORE, STAFF RECOMMENDS A

- 1 CONDITIONAL APPROVAL OF THE SUMMARY PLAN UNTIL
- 2 THESE REMAINING DOCUMENTS ARE ACTED ON BY THE
- 3 BOARD.
- 4 STAFF WILL CONTINUE TO WORK WITH THE
- 5 JURISDICTIONS INVOLVED TO COMPLETE THE PREPARATION
- 6 AND SUBMITTAL OF THESE DOCUMENTS. ONCE THE BOARD
- 7 HAS ACTED ON THESE DOCUMENTS, THE SUMMARY PLAN MAY
- 8 NEED TO BE REVISED TO ACCURATELY REFLECT THE
- 9 REMAINING DOCUMENTS. THEN THE COUNTYWIDE
- 10 INTEGRATED WASTE MANAGEMENT PLAN WILL BE COMPLETE
- 11 AND ELIGIBLE FOR APPROVAL.
- 12 BASED ON THIS INFORMATION, BOARD
- 13 STAFF RECOMMEND CONDITIONAL APPROVAL OF THE FRESNO
- 14 COUNTY SUMMARY PLAN. THIS CONCLUDES MY
- 15 PRESENTATION. I'LL BE HAPPY TO ANSWER ANY
- 16 QUESTIONS.
- 17 CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: ARE THERE ANY
- 18 QUESTIONS OR COMMENTS? IF NOT, I WILL ENTERTAIN A
- 19 MOTION TO ACCEPT THE STAFF RECOMMENDATION TO
- 20 CONDITIONALLY APPROVE THE SUMMARY PLAN FOR FRESNO
- 21 COUNTY AND FORWARD IT TO THE BOARD'S CONSENT
- 22 CALENDAR.
- 23 MEMBER GOTCH: SO MOVED.
- 24 MEMBER FRAZEE: SECOND.
- 25 CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: IT'S BEEN MOVED AND

- 1 SECONDED. WE'LL SUBSTITUTE PRIOR ROLL CALL.
- 2 MOTION PASSES THREE ZERO. THANK YOU.
- 3 NEXT ITEM IS ITEM 18, WHICH IS
- 4 CONSIDERATION OF OPTIONS FOR GRANTING TIME
- 5 EXTENSIONS FOR MEETING THE MANDATED DIVERSION
- 6 GOALS FOR JURISDICTIONS WITH BOARD APPROVED

SOURCE

- 7 REDUCTION AND RECYCLING ELEMENTS.
- 8 MS. VAN KEKERIX: I'M GOING TO DO A
- 9 LITTLE BIT OF AN INTRODUCTION ON THIS ONE. LLOYD
- 10 IS GOING TO GIVE THE MAIN PRESENTATION.
- 11 WE'RE PRESENTING THIS ITEM TO THE
- 12 COMMITTEE IN KEEPING WITH THE PAST PRACTICE OF
- 13 COMING TO THE BOARD WITH A SEPARATE POLICY AGENDA
- 14 ITEM BEFORE YOU CONSIDER THE FIRST SPECIFIC
- 15 INSTANCE OF USING A POLICY. THE ACT HAS QUITE A
- 16 BIT OF FLEXIBILITY IN IT IN TERMS OF

JURISDICTIONS

- 17 BEING ABLE TO REQUEST EITHER REDUCTIONS IN GOALS,
- 18 OR IN THIS CASE WE'RE GETTING OUR FIRST APPLI-
- 19 CATIONS IN FOR REQUESTS FOR TIME EXTENSIONS TO
- 20 MEET THE GOALS.
- 21 SO THE POLICY ITEM HERE REFLECTS

THE

- 22 FIRST FORMAL CONSIDERATION THAT THE BOARD HAS HAD
- ON HOW TO DEAL WITH THE REQUESTS FOR TIME

24 EXTENSIONS. THESE JURISDICTIONS ARE NOT ASKI 25 FOR REDUCED GOALS. THEY'RE ASKING FOR UP TO EXTENSIONS. THESE JURISDICTIONS ARE NOT ASKING

THREE

- 1 YEARS OF ADDITIONAL TIME, DEPENDING ON VARIOUS
- 2 CIRCUMSTANCES WITHIN THE JURISDICTION, TO MEET

THE

- 3 GOALS OF BOTH 25 AND 50 PERCENT. AND I'LL TURN
- 4 THE PRESENTATION OVER TO LLOYD.
- 5 MR. DILLON: GOOD MORNING, CHAIRMAN
- 6 CHESBRO AND COMMITTEE MEMBERS. AGAIN, I'M LLOYD
- 7 DILLON WITH THE OFFICE OF LOCAL ASSISTANCE HERE.
- 8 THIS ITEM DEALS WITH THE QUESTION

OF

- 9 HOW SHOULD THE BOARD HANDLE REQUESTS FROM CITIES
- 10 AND COUNTIES FOR TIME EXTENSIONS FOR MEETING THE
- 11 DIVERSION REQUIREMENTS OF THE INTEGRATED WASTE
- 12 MANAGEMENT ACT. PUBLIC RESOURCES CODE PROVIDES
- 13 FOR THREE DIFFERENT LENGTH TIME EXTENSIONS.

THESE

- ARE A ONE-YEAR, A TWO-YEAR, AND A THREE-YEAR.
- THE JURISDICTIONS MEETING THE
- 16 REQUIREMENTS OF ONE OR MORE OF THESE SECTIONS MAY
- 17 FORMALLY REQUEST THE BOARD TO CONSIDER A TIME
- 18 EXTENSION -- CONSIDER GRANTING ONE TO THEM. ONE-
- OR TWO-YEAR TIME EXTENSIONS MAY BE GRANTED WHEN A
- 20 JURISDICTION DEMONSTRATES THAT ADVERSE MARKET OR
- 21 ECONOMIC CONDITIONS EXISTED WHICH PREVENTED THEM
- 22 FROM MEETING THE DIVERSION GOALS IN 1995 AND THAT
- JURISDICTION DEMONSTRATES THAT THE MAXIMUM

- FEASIBLE AMOUNT OF SOURCE REDUCTION, RECYCLING,
- 25 AND COMPOSTING OF SOLID WASTE WITHIN ITS JURISDIC-

- 1 TION HAS BEEN REACHED.
- 2 THE ONE-YEAR TIME EXTENSION APPLIES
- 3 TO ALL JURISDICTIONS, WHILE THE TWO-YEAR TIME
- 4 EXTENSION IS LIMITED TO RURAL JURISDICTIONS ONLY.
- 5 A THREE-YEAR TIME EXTENSION MAY BE
- 6 GRANTED TO A NEWLY INCORPORATED CITY THAT IS
- 7 LOCATED IN AN AREA THAT DID NOT INCLUDE PROVISIONS
- 8 IN FRANCHISE AGREEMENTS WHICH ENSURED THAT THE NOW
- 9 INCORPORATED AREA WOULD COMPLY WITH THE DIVERSION
- 10 REQUIREMENTS OF THE ACT.
- 11 TO DATE THE BOARD HAS ONLY GRANTED
- 12 PETITIONS FOR REDUCTIONS IN THE DIVERSION GOALS,
- 13 NOT TIME EXTENSIONS FOR MEETING THOSE GOALS.
- 14 STAFF HAVE DEVELOPED FOUR OPTIONS
- 15 WHICH THE COMMITTEE AND BOARD MIGHT CHOOSE TO
- 16 CONSIDER IN DETERMINING WHETHER TO GRANT TIME
- 17 EXTENSIONS TO JURISDICTIONS. ONE IS DENY THE
- 18 REQUEST FOR RETROACTIVE PETITIONS FOR EXTENSIONS
- 19 WHEN THE MEASUREMENT TIME PERIOD IS PAST.
- 20 TWO IS GRANT ONLY ONE OF THE THREE
- 21 TYPES OF TIME EXTENSIONS AVAILABLE FOR MEETING THE
- 22 DIVERSION REOUIREMENTS TO OUALIFYING JURISDICTIONS
- 23 WHO MEET THE RECOMMENDED CRITERIA.
- 24 THREE IS SIMULTANEOUSLY OR CONSECU-
- 25 TIVELY GRANT ONE OR MORE OF THE THREE TYPES OF

- 1 TIME EXTENSIONS FOR MEETING THE DIVERSION
- 2 REQUIREMENTS.
- 3 CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: KIND OF LIKE DOUBLE
- 4 COUPONS AT THE GROCERY STORE.
- 5 MR. DILLON: DOUBLE AND TRIPLE.
- 6 CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: CAN THEY MULTIPLY THEM
- 7 OR JUST ADD THEM?
- 8 MR. DILLON: THAT'S NOT CLEAR IN THE
- 9 STATUTE IF THEY CAN DO THAT.
- 10 AND OPTION 4 WOULD BE TO DENY THE
- 11 REOUEST FOR TIME EXTENSION FOR MEETING THE
- 12 REQUIREMENTS IF THE JURISDICTION DOES NOT MEET
- 13 THEIR CRITERIA.
- 14 STAFF RECOMMENDS THAT THE BOARD
- 15 CONSIDER OPTIONS 1, 2, AND 4. OPTION 3, WHICH YOU
- 16 JUST DISCUSSED, CHAIRMAN CHESBRO, WAS NOT ONE OF
- 17 OUR PREFERRED OPTIONS.
- 18 CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: WAS THAT A DISCUSSION?
- 19 MR. DILLON: OPTION 1, WHICH IS NOT
- 20 GRANTING RETROACTIVE PETITIONS FOR TIME EXTEN-
- 21 SIONS, THIS IS CONSISTENT WITH THE BOARD'S
- 22 EXISTING POLICY TO NOT GRANT RETROACTIVE PETITIONS
- 23 FOR REDUCTIONS WHEN THE MEASURABLE TIME PERIOD IS
- 24 PAST. FOR EXAMPLE, THE BOARD WOULD NOT GRANT A
- 25 ONE-YEAR TIME EXTENSION FOR THE 1995 GOAL SINCE

- 1 THE ORIGINAL MEASUREMENT PERIOD, 1995, AND THE
- 2 EXTENDED PERIOD, 1996, HAVE PASSED. LIKEWISE, THE
- 3 BOARD WOULD NOT GRANT TWO-YEAR TIME EXTENSIONS
- 4 AFTER 1997. THAT WOULD BE FOR THE RURAL
- 5 JURISDICTIONS.
- 6 CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: SO WHEN YOU SAY THE
- 7 MEASUREMENT PERIOD IS PAST, YOU TALKING ABOUT THE
- 8 MEASUREMENT PERIOD AND THE EXTENSION PERIOD?
- 9 MR. DILLON: YES. RIGHT NOW THE LAW IS
- 10 25 BY '95; AND IF YOU EXTEND IT ONE YEAR, BE '96,
- 11 THAT'S PAST. WE'RE IN '97, SO IF YOU EXTEND IT
- 12 TWO YEARS, '97 IS GOING TO BE PAST.
- 13 CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: SO WHAT WOULD BE THE
- 14 POINT OF EXTENDING IT TO THE END OF '96 IF THE --
- 15 IF THAT EXTENSION PERIOD IS BEHIND US?
- 16 MR. DILLON: PRECISELY. THAT'S OUR
- 17 RECOMMENDATION, TO NOT GRANT THOSE FOR JURIS-
- 18 DICTIONS WHICH REQUEST A ONE-YEAR AT THIS POINT
- 19 BECAUSE '96 IS ALSO PAST. BUT DURING '97 YOU
- 20 MIGHT CONSIDER GRANTING FOR RURAL JURISDICTIONS
- 21 BECAUSE '97 IS STILL WITH US, AND THEY COULD

HAVE

- 22 THAT MEASURABLE YEAR.
- 23 OPTION 2 IS TO GRANT ONLY ONE OF

THE

THREE TYPES OF TIME EXTENSIONS AVAILABLE. FOR

Please note: These transcripts are not individually reviewed and approved for accuracy.

25 INSTANCE, THE BOARD WOULD NOT CONSIDER GRANTING
A

- 1 NEWLY INCORPORATED RURAL CITY A THREE-YEAR,
- 2 TWO-YEAR, AND ONE-YEAR EXTENSION. THAT WOULD BE
- 3 THE THREE-YEAR FOR THE NEWLY INCORPORATED CITY,
- 4 THE TWO-YEAR FOR THE RURAL, AND THE ONE-YEAR THAT
- 5 ANY COULD GET. THAT WOULD BE FOR A TOTAL OF SIX
- 6 YEARS EXTENSION. WE DIDN'T THINK THIS WAS WITHIN
- 7 THE INTENT OF THE STATUTE WHEN IT WAS WRITTEN.
- 8 AND OUR RECOMMENDATION IS ONLY TO ALLOW ONE TYPE
- 9 OF TIME EXTENSION AT ONCE.
- 10 FINALLY, OPTION 4, WHICH WOULD BE TO
- 11 DENY THEIR REQUEST FOR TIME EXTENSION FOR MEETING
- 12 THE DIVERSION REQUIREMENTS IF THE JURISDICTION DID
- 13 NOT MEET THE CONDITIONS FOR GRANTING EXTENSION.
- 14 FOR INSTANCE, THE BOARD COULD CONSIDER NOT
- 15 ALLOWING THE TIME EXTENSION IF THE LOCAL
- 16 JURISDICTION CANNOT SUBSTANTIATE THAT ADVERSE
- 17 ECONOMIC OR MARKET CONDITIONS EXISTED THAT
- 18 SEVERELY OR SIGNIFICANTLY AFFECTED THEM FROM
- 19 REACHING THE GOALS OR FOR A NEWLY INCORPORATED
- 20 CITY, THAT AGREEMENTS DID EXIST WHICH PROVIDED FOR
- 21 THEM TO IMPLEMENT PROGRAMS TO REACH THE GOAL.
- 22 STAFF RECOMMENDS THESE OPTIONS
- 23 BECAUSE WE ARE PAST THE 25-PERCENT GOAL YEAR, THAT
- 24 WOULD BE FOR NOT ALLOWING THE RETROACTIVE ONES,
- 25 AND GRANTING EXTENSIONS FOR MEETING THE GOAL YEAR

- 1 BEYOND 1996 OR 1997. SEEMS UNCALLED FOR AT THIS
- 2 POINT. AND THE JURISDICTIONS WILL STILL HAVE THE
- 3 OPPORTUNITY TO PRESENT INFORMATION FOR BOARD
- 4 CONSIDERATION ON GOOD FAITH EFFORT AND TO REQUEST
- 5 AN ALTERNATIVE TO THE 50-PERCENT GOAL YEARS.
- 6 WE'RE APPROACHING THAT.
- 7 LITTLE BACKGROUND. THE ONE-YEAR
- 8 TIME EXTENSION CAN BE GRANTED TO A CITY OR COUNTY
- 9 THAT PROVIDES SUBSTANTIAL EVIDENCE IN THE RECORD
- 10 THAT ADVERSE MARKET CONDITIONS EXISTED BEYOND
- 11 THEIR CONTROL THAT AFFECTED THEM IMPLEMENTING
- 12 PROGRAMS TO MEET THE GOAL, SUCCESSFULLY
- 13 IMPLEMENTING PROGRAMS. THE CITY AND COUNTY
- 14 SUBMITS A PLAN OF CORRECTION THAT DEMONSTRATES
- 15 THAT THEY WILL MEET THE DIVERSION GOALS BEFORE THE
- 16 TIME EXTENSION EXPIRES, AND THE CITY OR COUNTY
- 17 DEMONSTRATES THAT ACHIEVING THE MAXIMUM FEASIBLE
- 18 AMOUNT OF SOURCE REDUCTION, RECYCLING, AND
- 19 COMPOSTING DIVERSION OR IMPLEMENTATION OF THE
- 20 PROGRAMS.
- THE TWO-YEAR IS BASICALLY THE SAME
- 22 THING, ONLY IT'S FOR A RURAL JURISDICTION TO APPLY
- 23 FOR THAT. AND AGAIN, THE THREE YEARS FOR A NEWLY
- 24 INCORPORATED CITY THAT WAS INCORPORATED AFTER
- 25 JANUARY 1, 1990, AND THAT THERE WAS NOT A

- 1 PROVISION IN THE CONTRACT OR AGREEMENT WITHIN THE
- 2 COUNTY IN THAT AREA THAT PROVIDED FOR THEM
- 3 SUCCESSFULLY IMPLEMENTING PROGRAMS TO MEET THE
- 4 DIVERSION GOALS.
- 5 THE BOARD MAY AUTHORIZE A CITY WHICH
- 6 MEETS ANY OF THESE CRITERIA BY PROVIDING AN
- 7 IMPLEMENTATION SCHEDULE THAT SHOWS THAT THE CITY
- 8 WILL DIVERT 25 PERCENT BY THE NEWLY PROJECTED YEAR
- 9 AND IT WILL DIVERT 50 PERCENT LATER ON. UNDER
- 10 CERTAIN CIRCUMSTANCES YOU MIGHT ONLY WANT TO
- 11 CONSIDER THE 25-PERCENT GOAL YEAR FOR THE NEWLY
- 12 INCORPORATED CITY. IT'S BOTH INSTANCES.
- 13 UPON RECEIPT OF REQUESTS FOR TIME
- 14 EXTENSION, BOARD STAFF REVIEW AND ANALYZE THE
- 15 REQUESTS TO ASSESS RELATIVE MERIT OF IT. IN THE
- 16 REVIEW AND ANALYSIS, WE CONSIDER WHETHER A
- 17 JURISDICTION MEETS THE STATUTORY CRITERIA FOR THE
- 18 EXTENSION. AND BASED ON THE INFORMATION
- 19 AVAILABLE, WE ALSO DETERMINE THE TYPES OF
- 20 EXTENSIONS THAT THEY MAY BE APPLYING FOR.
- 21 STAFF EVALUATE IF ALL FEASIBLE
- 22 DIVERSION PROGRAMS WERE IMPLEMENTED AND WHETHER
- 23 THE JURISDICTION SEEMS CAPABLE OF DIVERTING MORE
- 24 THAN PROJECTED IN THE ANNUAL REPORT OR THE
- 25 DISPOSAL REDUCTION CALCULATIONS. WE DO THIS

- 1 THROUGH PHONE CALLS AND OTHER COMMUNICATION WITH
- 2 THE LOCAL JURISDICTION.
- 3 WE ALSO CONSIDER OTHER CRITICAL
- 4 THINGS SUCH AS LOCATION OF MARKETS, VOLUME OF
- 5 RECYCLABLES, LOCAL STAFF, AND FINANCIAL RESOURCES,
- 6 CURRENT DIVERSION PROGRAMS, PLANNED DIVERSION
- 7 PROGRAMS, THE JURISDICTION'S GOOD FAITH EFFORT TO
- 8 IMPLEMENT PROGRAMS, AND THE EXISTENCE OR
- 9 NONEXISTENCE OF SOLID WASTE FRANCHISES AND
- 10 AGREEMENTS.
- 11 FOR THE TWO-YEAR, WE ALSO EVALUATE
- 12 WHETHER OR NOT THERE'S OTHER CERTAIN CIRCUMSTANCES
- 13 IN THE RURAL COMMUNITY WHICH AFFECT THEIR ABILITY
- 14 TO REACH THEIR GOAL.
- 15 BASED ON ITS EVALUATION, STAFF WILL
- 16 MAKE RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE COMMITTEE:
- 17 RECOMMENDATION OF THE APPROVAL, CONDITIONAL
- APPROVAL, OR DISAPPROVAL OF THE JURISDICTION'S
- 19 REQUEST FOR TIME EXTENSION.
- 20 AND THAT CONCLUDES STAFF'S
- 21 PRESENTATION, AND OUR RECOMMENDATION IS FOR
- 22 OPTIONS 1, 2, AND 4.
- 23 CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: I ALWAYS HATE TO DO
- 24 THIS TO YOU, BUT SOMETHING OCCURRED TO ME WHILE
- 25 SITTING HERE LISTENING TO YOU, WHICH I, OF COURSE,

- 1 DIDN'T BRING UP IN THE STAFF BRIEFING, SO I
- 2 APOLOGIZE. IF I HAD THOUGHT OF IT EARLIER, I
- 3 WOULD HAVE TOLD YOU.
- 4 WHAT ABOUT THE SCENARIO, SINCE WE
- 5 ARE, AT LEAST FOR THE 1995 YEAR, WELL PAST THE END
- 6 OF '95 AND PRETTY MUCH INTO '97 BY THE TIME WE'RE
- 7 FULLY ASCERTAINING THE ACHIEVEMENTS OF THE
- 8 JURISDICTIONS IN TERMS OF THEIR MEASUREMENTS AND
- 9 ADJUSTMENTS AND ALL OF THAT, WHAT IF A JURIS-
- 10 DICTION WERE IN A POSITION WHERE THEY DIDN'T
- 11 ACHIEVE 25 PERCENT IN 1995, BUT THEY COULD
- 12 DEMONSTRATE THAT THEY DID ACHIEVE IT WITHIN A YEAR
- 13 LATER? DID YOU CONSIDER THAT SCENARIO IN TERMS OF
- 14 THAT RETROACTIVE OUESTION?
- 15 MR. DILLON: WE DID. AND I'D LIKE TO
- 16 CALL ON MY COUNSEL TO HELP ME OUT HERE ON THIS
- 17 TOO. I'D LIKE TO PUNT TO ELLIOT BLOCK IF I COULD.
- 18 WE DID. WHAT WE GOT IN WERE THE ANNUAL REPORTS
- 19 THAT HAVE VARIOUS CALCULATIONS, BOTH BASE YEAR
- 20 ECONOMIC PROJECTIONS, POPULATION PROJECTIONS, AND
- 21 THEIR ADJUSTMENTS. AND STAFF IS ALSO WORKING ON
- 22 REVISING THOSE AND ANALYZING THOSE TO SEE IF MAYBE
- 23 THE JURISDICTION DID MEET THE GOAL, OR WHAT WAS
- 24 WRONG IN SHOWING WHY THEY DIDN'T REACH THE GOAL.
- 25 IT MIGHT HAVE BEEN THE CALCULATIONS WERE IN ERROR.

- 1 IT MIGHT HAVE BEEN THAT THE PROGRAMS THAT THEY PUT
- 2 ON-LINE BASED ON THE ORIGINAL SOLID WASTE
- 3 GENERATION STUDY WERE NOT ACCURATE AND THEY
- 4 TARGETED THE WRONG MATERIAL, SO THEY HAVE TO DO
- 5 SOME OTHER PROGRAMS.
- 6 SO OUR PROPOSAL WOULD BE TO WORK
- 7 WITH THEM ON THAT TO MOVE FORWARD TO THE 50-
- 8 PERCENT GOAL AND RECOGNIZE THAT THEY HAVE MADE
- 9 GOOD FAITH EFFORTS AS FAR AS ANY ADMINISTRATIVE
- 10 ACTION OR COMING BACK BEFORE THE COMMITTEE. I'D
- 11 LIKE TO TURN THAT OVER TO LORRAINE OR ELLIOT.
- 12 CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: IT MAY BE MORE
- 13 RELEVANT, IN FACT, FOR THE YEAR 2000 THAN FOR '95.
- 14 SUDDENLY THIS SORT OF SCENARIO WHERE SOMEONE WAS
- 15 ON A CURVE WHERE THEY FELL BELOW THE POINT AT THE
- 16 TIME OF MEASUREMENT, BUT COULD MAKE A CLAIM THAT
- 17 WITHIN A YEAR THEY DID, AND THE EXTENSION COULD BE
- 18 RELEVANT TO THEM. ARE YOU FOLLOWING MY THINKING
- 19 HERE?
- 20 MS. VAN KEKERIX: YES. THE BOARD DOES
- 21 HAVE A LOT OF FLEXIBILITY IN WHAT IT LOOKS AT IN
- 22 TERMS OF REVIEWING A JURISDICTION, AND THAT'S
- 23 GOING TO HAPPEN AT THE BIENNIAL REVIEW. SO THAT
- 24 WILL BE -- THAT'S WHEN THE BOARD WOULD CONSIDER
- 25 WHAT THE JURISDICTION HAD DONE. AND I THINK THAT

- 1 AT THAT POINT IN TIME, THERE'S CONSIDERABLE
- 2 FLEXIBILITY IN HOW THE BOARD LOOKS AT IT AND ALSO
- 3 IN TERMS OF LOOKING AT GOOD FAITH EFFORTS TO MEET
- 4 THE GOALS.
- 5 IF THEY IMPLEMENTED PROGRAMS TO MEET
- 6 THE GOAL AND THEY'RE JUST SHORT OF IT, THEN THE
- 7 BOARD COULD STILL FIND THEY HAD MET THE MANDATES
- 8 OF THE LAW. BUT YOU ARE GOING TO BE DOING THAT
- 9 DURING THE BIENNIAL REVIEWS. THAT'S WHEN THAT
- 10 WOULD COME BEFORE THE BOARD FOR THEIR DECISION
- 11 POINT.
- 12 CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: SO I'M INTERPRETING
- 13 WHAT YOU ARE SAYING AS THAT THE OTHER VEHICLES THE
- 14 BOARD HAS FOR SHOWING FLEXIBILITY TOWARDS JURIS-
- 15 DICTIONS WOULD BE TO PROVIDE THE OPPORTUNITY FOR
- 16 THEM TO MAKE THAT CASE, THAT, FOR EXAMPLE, IF WE
- 17 HAD BEFORE US, DID YOU MAKE IT OR NOT TEN MONTHS
- 18 AFTER THE FACT OR SOMETHING, AND THEY SAID, "WELL,
- 19 WE HAVE NUMBERS RIGHT NOW THAT SHOW THAT WE ARE,
- 20 IN FACT, AT 50 PERCENT. MAYBE WE WEREN'T AT THE
- 21 DATE OF THE LAST MEASUREMENT, " THE BOARD COULD
- 22 SAY, "WELL, OBVIOUSLY IT'S A GOOD FAITH EFFORT."
- MS. VAN KEKERIX: WELL, I THINK IT'S REAL
- 24 IMPORTANT TO REMEMBER THAT THE LAW SAYS THAT THEY
- 25 NEED TO IMPLEMENT PROGRAMS TO TRY TO ACHIEVE THE

- 1 GOALS. SO IF THEY'VE IMPLEMENTED THEIR PROGRAMS
- 2 AND DONE THEIR BEST TO MEET THE GOAL, THEN I THINK
- 3 THE BOARD HAS THE ABILITY TO SAY THAT THEY'VE MET
- 4 THE MANDATE, WHETHER OR NOT THEIR NUMBER WAS RIGHT
- 5 AT THE 25 OR THE 50.
- 6 CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: OKAY. THAT'S MAKING
- 7 SENSE TO ME. DO YOU WANT TO ADD ANYTHING, ELLIOT?
- 8 MR. BLOCK: I'LL RISK A LITTLE BIT, NOT
- 9 TOO MUCH. THE POINT ALSO TO KEEP IN CONTEXT --
- 10 KEEP THIS IN CONTEXT IS THAT WHAT WE'RE TALKING
- 11 ABOUT REALLY, THE REASON THIS IS COMING FORWARD,
- 12 IS TO PROVIDE SOME DIRECTION BOTH TO STAFF IN
- 13 TERMS OF HOW THEY DEAL WITH THESE ISSUES AS
- 14 THEY'RE COMING UP AND THEN ALSO FOR JURISDICTIONS
- 15 TO SAY THAT THE PREFERRED ROUTE FOR THESE KINDS OF
- 16 SITUATIONS AT THIS POINT IS NOT TO HAVE FOLKS
- 17 SPENDING THEIR TIME TRYING TO GET EXTENSIONS FOR
- 18 1995 FOR A YEAR AFTER '96.
- 19 HOWEVER, THIS IS A POLICY. IT'S NOT
- 20 REGULATIONS THAT WE'RE DOING AND THE LIKE. SO THE
- 21 BOARD THEORETICALLY, SHOULD A VERY UNUSUAL
- 22 SITUATION COME UP AND WHEN WE'RE DOING THE
- 23 BIENNIAL REVIEWS, ALWAYS HAS THAT ABILITY TO
- 24 CHANGE SOME THINGS. THIS IS MUCH SIMILAR TO

WITH

Please note: These transcripts are not individually reviewed and approved for accuracy.

THE PETITIONS. THIS IS MUCH MORE OF A TRYING TO

- 1 SEND A MESSAGE WE THINK YOU OUGHT TO CONCENTRATE
- 2 ON DOING IT THIS WAY, BUT IT DOESN'T PROHIBIT A
- 3 CHANGE DOWN THE ROAD IF THAT WOULD BE

APPROPRIATE.

4 CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: OKAY. DO WE HAVE

ANY

- 5 HANDLE ON HOW MANY JURISDICTIONS HAVE SHOWN AN
- 6 INTEREST IN EXTENSIONS OR MIGHT BE ELIGIBLE?

AND

7 ALSO, I GUESS, THEN THE SECOND PART WOULD BE

HOW

8 MANY MIGHT BE EXCLUDED? HAVE YOU LOOKED AT

THOSE

- 9 QUESTIONS?
- 10 MR. DILLON: YES, WE HAVE. FOR THE
- 11 ONE-YEAR EXTENSION, ALL JURISDICTIONS COULD

APPLY.

12 THEY HAVEN'T. FOR THE RURAL, I BELIEVE IT'S

ABOUT

90 JURISDICTIONS COULD APPLY AT THIS POINT.

AND

- 14 FOR NEWLY INCORPORATED IT'S SIX, SIX JURISDIC-
- 15 TIONS.
- 16 CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: AND THAT'S
- 17 UNPREDICTABLE BECAUSE MORE JURISDICTIONS WILL

BE

- 18 CREATED UNDOUBTEDLY IN THE FUTURE.
- MS. VAN KEKERIX: A FEW OF THE RURAL
- JURISDICTIONS HAVE BEEN TALKING WITH STAFF

ABOUT

- THE POSSIBILITY OF THE TWO-YEAR EXTENSION FOR '95.
- 22 CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: AND THE PROVISION

FOR

- THE EXTENSION IN THE CODE IS ONE TIME?
- MR. BLOCK: WELL, I THINK THAT'S ONE

OF

25 THE REASONS THIS IS COMING FORWARD. THE STATUTE

- 1 JUST DOESN'T REALLY SAY ONE WAY OR THE OTHER.
- 2 AND, YOU KNOW, YOU CAN GET INTO ISSUES OF DIS-
- 3 CUSSING LEGISLATIVE INTENT. THE PRESUMPTION THAT
- 4 WE'VE MADE GOING FORWARD IS THAT IT'S TALKING
- 5 ABOUT A ONE TIME BECAUSE THERE REALLY WASN'T ANY
- 6 DISCUSSION AS FAR AS WE CAN SEE OF CONTINUED OR
- 7 REPEATED EXTENSIONS, AND THAT DOESN'T SEEM TO HAVE
- 8 EVER BEEN PART OF THE CONSIDERATION. THERE'S NO
- 9 EXPLICIT LANGUAGE REALLY ONE WAY OR THE OTHER IN
- 10 THE STATUTE.
- 11 CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: PART OF THE DISCUSSION
- 12 IN THE LEGISLATURE, AS I REMEMBER IT, HAD TO DO
- 13 WITH IT BEING SORT OF A PRESSURE RELEASE VALVE IF,
- 14 IN FACT, YOU KNOW, THE ECONOMY IS TERRIBLE AND
- 15 MARKETS ARE TERRIBLE AND NOTHING IS WORKING, THAT,
- 16 YOU KNOW, THE BOARD IS IN A POSITION TO RESPOND TO
- 17 THAT. SO PRESUMABLY, THEN, WITHIN THE CODE --
- 18 THIS IS NOT WHAT'S ENVISIONED BY THE STAFF, BUT
- 19 THERE IS -- IT'S PRETTY BROAD IN TERMS OF WHETHER
- OR NOT WE WOULD CONSIDER IT ONE TIME.
- MR. BLOCK: WELL, I MEAN I WOULDN'T
- 22 DESCRIBE IT AS BEING BROAD. I JUST WOULD DESCRIBE
- 23 IT AS NOT REALLY ADDRESSING IT IN THE LANGUAGE ONE
- 24 WAY OR THE OTHER. I MEAN, FOR INSTANCE, IF YOU
- 25 WERE TO ASK ME TO START AN ANALYSIS, AND I WON'T

- 1 GO INTO AN IN-DEPTH ANALYSIS, JUST TO GIVE YOU AN
- 2 IDEA, TYPICAL RULES OF STATUTORY CONSTRUCTION,
- 3 YOU'VE GOT AN EXTENSION FOR MARKET CONDITIONS:
- 4 ONE YEAR FOR ALL JURISDICTIONS, TWO YEARS FOR
- 5 RURALS. TYPICAL STATUTORY RULE OF CONSTRUCTION
- 6 WOULD SAY THE FACT THAT THERE HAD TO BE A

SEPARATE

- 7 TWO-YEAR EXTENSION FOR RURAL JURISDICTIONS
- 8 INDICATES THAT THEY WOULDN'T HAVE BEEN ABLE TO
- 9 RELY ON HAVING TWO ONE-YEARS IN A ROW.
- 10 NOW, YOU CAN ARGUE THAT A COUPLE
- 11 DIFFERENT WAYS. THAT'S THE KIND OF LEVEL OF
- 12 DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS YOU'D HAVE TO GET INTO

ΙF

- 13 WE HAVE TO DEAL WITH THAT ISSUE.
- 14 CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: THOSE ARE

HYPOTHETICAL

AT THIS POINT, SO I WON'T GO TOO MUCH FURTHER

WITH

- 16 EVERY IMAGINABLE SCENARIO. FOR NOW, I THINK
- 17 YOU'VE PUT FORWARD SOMETHING THAT DEALS WITH THE
- 18 SCENARIOS THAT APPEAR TO BE DEVELOPING.
- 19 HAVE WE DONE ANY SHOPPING OF THIS
- 20 WITH THE ORGANIZATIONS THAT REPRESENT LOCAL
- 21 GOVERNMENTS: CSAC, LEAGUE, RCRC?
- MS. VAN KEKERIX: WE HAVE NOT SPOKEN TO

- THEM ON THIS. WE CAN.
- 24 CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: MAYBE BETWEEN NOW

AND

THE BOARD MEETING, IT WOULD BE NICE TO MAKE SURE

- 1 WE'RE NOT GOING TO AFTER THE FACT HAVE THEM DOWN
- 2 HERE. I KNOW THEY'VE BEEN PRETTY SUPPORTIVE OF
- 3 MOST OF THE WAYS WE HAVE GONE ABOUT THESE THINGS,
- 4 AND I PRESUME THEY WOULD PROBABLY VIEW THIS
- 5 POSITIVELY. IT'S ALWAYS GOOD TO NOT FIND OUT
- 6 LATER THAT THEY HAVE A PROBLEM. SO MAYBE BETWEEN
- 7 NOW AND THE BOARD MEETING WE COULD DO THAT, MAKE
- 8 INFORMAL CONTACT, PHONE CALLS, PROVIDE COPIES.
- 9 I GUESS MY LAST QUESTION WOULD BE IS
- 10 THIS A POLICY INTERPRETATION FROM THE COMMITTEE,
- 11 OR IS THIS SOMETHING WE'RE REFERRING TO THE BOARD
- 12 FOR BOARD APPROVAL?
- 13 MS. VAN KEKERIX: WE WERE RECOMMENDING
- 14 THAT IT GO TO THE BOARD FOR BOARD APPROVAL JUST
- 15 LIKE THE POLICY ON THE PETITIONS FOR REDUCTION
- 16 DID.
- 17 CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: ARE THERE OTHER
- 18 QUESTIONS?
- 19 MEMBER GOTCH: NO.
- 20 MEMBER FRAZEE: JUST ONE. THE 90 RURAL
- 21 JURISDICTIONS THAT ARE ELIGIBLE, HOW MANY TOTAL
- 22 ELIGIBLE RURAL JURISDICTIONS ARE THERE THAT MEET
- 23 THE TEST OF BEING CLASSIFIED RURAL?
- 24 MR. DILLON: I BELIEVE THAT WE LOOKED IT
- 25 OVER, AND WE FELT THAT 90 COULD FALL INTO THAT

- 1 CATEGORY COULD APPLY FOR IT AT THIS TIME.
- 2 MEMBER FRAZEE: HAVEN'T SOME OF THOSE 90
- 3 ALREADY MET THE REQUIREMENT?
- 4 MR. DILLON: EITHER HAVE MET, ON THE WAY,
- 5 OR ALREADY HAVE RECEIVED THE REDUCTION.
- 6 MS. VAN KEKERIX: I BELIEVE THAT IT'S A
- 7 TOTAL OF ABOUT 128 JURISDICTIONS MEET THE
- 8 STATUTORY DEFINITION OF RURAL, BUT LLOYD IS SAYING
- 9 THAT 90 MIGHT BE INTERESTED IN -- UP TO 90 COULD
- 10 BE INTERESTED IN THIS EXTENSION.
- 11 CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: OKAY. ANY OTHER
- 12 QUESTIONS OR COMMENTS?
- MEMBER GOTCH: NO.
- 14 CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: IF NOT, I WILL
- 15 ENTERTAIN A MOTION TO APPROVE THE STAFF'S
- 16 RECOMMENDATION AND FORWARD IT TO THE BOARD'S
- 17 CONSENT AGENDA.
- 18 MEMBER GOTCH: SO MOVED.
- 19 MEMBER FRAZEE: SECOND.
- 20 CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: IT'S BEEN MOVED AND
- 21 SECONDED. WE'LL SUBSTITUTE THE PRIOR ROLL CALL.
- 22 MOTION PASSES THREE TO ZERO. THANKS VERY MUCH.
- 23 AND THE NEXT ITEM IS SPECIFIC
- 24 APPLICATION OF THAT POLICY WITH REGARDS TO THE
- 25 CITY OF LAKE FOREST IN ORANGE COUNTY, WHICH IS A

- 1 NEWLY INCORPORATED CITY, SO I ASSUME.
- 2 MS. VAN KEKERIX: YES. LLOYD WILL BE
- 3 GIVING THIS PRESENTATION AS WELL.
- 4 MR. DILLON: AS YOU STATED -- AGAIN, I'M
- 5 LLOYD DILLON FROM THE OFFICE OF LOCAL ASSISTANCE.
- 6 CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: THANKS FOR CLARIFYING
- 7 THAT.
- 8 MR. DILLON: THE CITY OF LAKE FOREST IS A
- 9 NEWLY INCORPORATED CITY WITHIN ORANGE COUNTY, AND
- 10 THEY'VE REQUESTED THE BOARD CONSIDER GRANTING THEM
- 11 A THREE-YEAR EXTENSION TO ALLOW THEM TO MEET THE
- 12 GOALS. AND THIS IS ALLOWED UNDER PUBLIC RESOURCES
- 13 CODE SECTION 41820.5.
- 14 THE BOARD APPROVED THE CITY'S SOURCE
- 15 REDUCTION AND RECYCLING ELEMENT ON MAY 23, 1995,
- 16 WITH ANTICIPATED 33.7-PERCENT AND 53.7-PERCENT
- 17 DIVERSION RATES. HOWEVER, BASED ON THE DISPOSAL
- 18 REDUCTION CALCULATION FROM THE CITY'S ANNUAL
- 19 REPORT, THE CITY HAS ONLY ACHIEVED A 19.7-PERCENT
- 20 DIVERSION RATE FOR 1995.
- 21 A THREE-YEAR TIME EXTENSION MAY BE
- 22 GRANTED WHEN A CITY IS NEWLY INCORPORATED AND
- 23 LOCATED IN AN AREA THAT DOES NOT INCLUDE PROVI-
- 24 SIONS IN ITS FRANCHISE AGREEMENT FOR THAT NEW
- 25 INCORPORATED AREA TO MEET THE GOALS.

1	BOARD STAFF HAVE DEVELOPED THREE
2	OPTIONS WHICH THE COMMITTEE MAY CHOOSE TO
3	CONSIDER. OPTION 1 WAS ACCEPT STAFF'S
4	RECOMMENDATION, WHICH IS APPROVAL OF THE REQUESTED
5	EXTENSION, AND FORWARD THAT TO THE FULL BOARD FOR
6	CONSIDERATION.
7	OPTION 2 IS TO MODIFY STAFF'S
8	RECOMMENDATION AND FORWARD THAT TO THE FULL BOARD
9	FOR CONSIDERATION.
10	OPTION 3 WOULD BE TO DIRECT STAFF TO
11	REEVALUATE THE REQUEST AND INCLUDE OR ADDRESS
12	ADDITIONAL INFORMATION AS DETERMINED BY THE
13	COMMITTEE AND BRING IT BACK AT A FUTURE DATE.
14	STAFF RECOMMENDS THAT THE BOARD
15	CONSIDER OPTION 1, APPROVAL OF THE THREE-YEAR TIME
16	EXTENSION TO THE CITY OF LAKE FOREST FOR MEETING
17	THE DIVERSION REQUIREMENTS OF THE INTEGRATED WASTE
18	MANAGEMENT ACT. STAFF MAKES THIS RECOMMENDATION
19	BECAUSE THE PUBLIC RESOURCES CODE ALLOWS THE BOARD
20	TO CONSIDER THIS AND TO MAKE THAT CONSIDERATION.
21	IF THE CITY WAS INCORPORATED AFTER JULY 1ST, 1990,
22	AND LAKE FOREST WAS, AND THE COUNTY WITHIN WHICH
23	THE CITY IS LOCATED DID NOT INCLUDE PROVISIONS IN
24	ITS FRANCHISE WHICH ENSURED A NEW INCORPORATED

25 COULD COMPLY AND THERE WERE NOT PROVISIONS IN

1	THERE.
2	CITY OF LAKE FOREST HAS MET THESE
3	CONDITIONS. THE CITY HAS ALSO FILED A REVISED
4	SCHEDULE FOR IMPLEMENTING PROGRAMS TO MEET THE
5	DIVERSION GOALS WITHIN 1998. AND THE CITY HAS
6	ALSO RECENTLY NEGOTIATED A NEW FRANCHISE AGREEMENT
7	WHICH ALLOWS FOR GREATER DIVERSION OPPORTUNITIES
8	AT REDUCED COST TO THE CITY AND ITS RESIDENTS.
9	BOARD STAFF REVIEWED AND ANALYZED
10	THE REQUEST TO ASSESS THE RELATIVE MERIT OF THE
11	CITY'S REQUEST. AND IN THE REVIEW, STAFF CONSIDER
12	WHETHER THE JURISDICTION MET THE STATUTORY
13	CRITERIA. THEY DID. STAFF EVALUATED ALL FEASIBLE
14	PROGRAMS WERE IMPLEMENTED AND WHETHER THE JURIS-
15	DICTION SEEMED CAPABLE OF DIVERTING MORE THAN
16	PROJECTED. THEY ARE. THEY HAVE IMPLEMENTED
17	PROGRAMS, AND THEY ARE GOING TO IMPLEMENT MORE
18	PROGRAMS. SO THERE IS ADDITIONAL OPPORTUNITY FOR
19	DIVERSION THERE TOO.
20	STAFF ALSO CONSIDERED OTHER
CRITERIA	
21	SUCH AS THE JURISDICTION'S GOOD FAITH EFFORT TO
22	IMPLEMENT DIVERSION PROGRAMS AND TO FINALIZE ITS
23	SOLID WASTE AGREEMENTS. AND THEY HAVE DONE THAT.
24	BASED ON OUR EVALUATIONS, STAFF

MAKE

Please note: These transcripts are not individually reviewed and approved for accuracy.

THE RECOMMENDATION TO THE COMMITTEE FOR APPROVAL

- 1 OF THE CITY OF LAKE FOREST REQUEST AND TO FORWARD
- 2 THAT TO THE BOARD.
- 3 CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: SO THEY'RE AT 19
- 4 PERCENT NOW.
- 5 MR. DILLON: 19.7 PERCENT IS WHAT THEY
- 6 PROJECTED.
- 7 CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: AND THEY'RE WORRIED
- 8 ABOUT NEEDING THREE YEARS TO GET FROM 19 TO 25?
- 9 MR. DILLON: THEY JUST WANT THAT
- 10 PROVISION SO THAT THEY LOOK GOOD. THEY KNOW
- 11 THEY'RE MOVING FORWARD. THEY DIDN'T HAVE THE
- 12 FRANCHISE IN PLACE. THEY COULDN'T IMPLEMENT MOST
- OF THEIR SMALLER PROGRAMS, SO NOW THEY CAN WITH
- 14 THAT.
- 15 CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: THEY'RE NOT ASKING FOR
- 16 REDUCTION IN THE 50 OR EXTENSION.
- 17 MR. DILLON: NO REDUCTION IN THE GOAL AT
- 18 ALL. WITH THE THREE-YEAR NEWLY INCORPORATED, IT'S
- 19 A 25- AND 50-PERCENT EXTENSION.
- 20 CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: SO IT'S BOTH. SO THEY
- 21 WOULD WIND UP WITH 19 -- YEAR 2000 AND YEAR 2003.
- MR. DILLON: YES. 1998 AND 2003 BECAUSE
- 23 THE BOARD HAS ALREADY APPROVED THEIR SOURCE
- 24 REDUCTION AND RECYCLING ELEMENT. WE HAD THESE
- 25 CONVERSATIONS WITH THE CITY ABOUT, YOU KNOW,

- 1 YOU'RE AWFULLY CLOSE. WE'LL DO ANALYSIS. WE'LL
- 2 DO THIS AND THAT. THEY WANTED TO GO FORWARD WITH
- 3 THIS INSTEAD. 19.7 PERCENT IS PRETTY CLOSE.
- 4 CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: YEAH. THAT'S WHAT
- 5 GETS ME. I MEAN I DON'T WANT TO ON THE ONE HAND
- 6 PENALIZE THEM FOR DOING RELATIVELY WELL FOR A NEW
- 7 CITY. ON THE OTHER HAND, I WONDER WHETHER OR NOT
- 8 THEY REALLY NEED THREE YEARS TO GET FROM 19 TO --
- 9 WELL, '98. WAIT A MINUTE. I'M THINKING THREE
- 10 YEARS FROM, BUT IT'S THREE YEARS FROM 1995, SO
- 11 IT'S NOT THREE YEARS FROM NOW. NEVER MIND.
- 12 MEMBER FRAZEE: ANSWERED MY QUESTION.
- MR. DILLON: CITY FULLY UNDERSTANDS THAT
- 14 THE REQUEST WOULD BE ABOUT FOR 16 MONTHS.
- 15 CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: I THINK THAT'S
- 16 REASONABLE. ANY OTHER QUESTIONS? OR COMMENTS?
- 17 MEMBER GOTCH: NO.
- 18 CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: IF NOT, THE MOTION
- 19 WOULD BE TO ADOPT STAFF RECOMMENDATION FOR THE
- 20 EXTENSION OF THREE YEARS FOR THE CITY OF LAKE
- 21 FOREST AND FORWARD IT TO THE BOARD'S CONSENT
- 22 CALENDAR.
- 23 MEMBER FRAZEE: SO MOVED.
- 24 MEMBER GOTCH: SECONDED.
- 25 CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: MOVED, SECONDED.

- 1 PRIOR ROLL CALL. AYES ARE THREE; NOES ARE ZERO,
- 2 AND THE MOTION CARRIES.
- 3 THE NEXT ITEM IS CONSIDERATION OF
- 4 STAFF RECOMMENDATION ON THE FEASIBILITY STUDY OF
- 5 COOPERATIVE MARKETING IN RURAL CALIFORNIA.
- 6 MS. VAN KEKERIX: AND JOHN NUFFER WITH
- 7 THE OFFICE OF LOCAL ASSISTANCE WILL BE MAKING THIS
- 8 PRESENTATION. THIS IS PART OF A LONG-TERM,
- 9 ONGOING EFFORT ON COOPERATIVE MARKETING FOR RURAL
- 10 JURISDICTIONS WITHIN CALIFORNIA.
- 11 MR. NUFFER: GOOD MORNING, CHAIRMAN
- 12 CHESBRO AND COMMITTEE MEMBERS. MY NAME IS JOHN
- 13 NUFFER WITH THE OFFICE OF LOCAL ASSISTANCE. AND
- 14 MY PURPOSE TODAY IS PRESENT THE RESULTS OF THE
- 15 BOARD'S STUDY OF RURAL COOPERATIVE MARKETING AND
- 16 TO GIVE YOU STAFF'S RECOMMENDATION FOR FUTURE WORK
- 17 ON THE SUBJECT.
- 18 WE'VE DEFINED COOPERATIVE MARKETING
- 19 TO MEAN TWO THINGS: THE SHARING OF COLLECTION OF
- 20 PROCESSING EQUIPMENT AND THE JOINT MARKETING OF
- 21 MATERIAL. AS DOCUMENTED BY SEVERAL NATIONAL AND
- 22 INTERNATIONAL STUDIES, POTENTIAL BENEFITS TO
- 23 CALIFORNIA'S RURAL JURISDICTIONS INCLUDE REDUCED
- 24 PROCESSING AND MARKETING COSTS, HIGHER PRICES FOR
- 25 RECYCLABLES, AND BROADER, MORE STABLE MARKETS FOR

- 1 RECYCLABLE MATERIALS. THE NET EFFECT COULD BE
- 2 INCREASED DIVERSION OF MATERIAL FROM LANDFILLS AND
- 3 MORE COST-EFFECTIVE ACHIEVEMENT OF THE 25- AND
- 4 50-PERCENT WASTE DISPOSAL REDUCTION GOALS.
- 5 AS BACKGROUND, THE BOARD GOT
- 6 INVOLVED IN THIS STUDY FOR SEVERAL REASONS. THE
- 7 BOARD FIRST RECOGNIZED THE NEED TO ASSIST JURIS-
- 8 DICTIONS IN A REPORT ENTITLED "WASTE DIVERSION IN
- 9 RURAL CALIFORNIA" PUBLISHED IN SEPTEMBER 1991.
- 10 ONE OF THE STRATEGIES IDENTIFIED IN THAT REPORT
- 11 WAS TO DEVELOP COOPERATIVE MARKETING PROGRAMS.
- 12 IN ADDITION, FROM STAFF'S WORK WITH
- 13 RURAL JURISDICTIONS, WE FOUND THAT RURAL JURIS-
- 14 DICTIONS OFTEN HAVE DIFFICULTY COLLECTING, TRANS-
- 15 PORTING, AND MARKETING ALL OF THEIR MATERIALS.
- 16 THIS IS BECAUSE IN RURAL AREAS MATERIALS ARE OFTEN
- 17 PRESENT IN SMALL VOLUMES, SPREAD OVER GREAT
- 18 DISTANCES, FAR FROM MAJOR MARKETS. FOR THIS AND
- 19 OTHER REASONS, JURISDICTIONS HAVE TOLD US THAT
- 20 THEY NEEDED HELP IN MEETING THE 50-PERCENT
- 21 DISPOSAL REDUCTION GOAL.
- 22 FURTHERMORE, THE REGIONAL COUNCIL OF
- 23 RURAL COUNTIES, WHICH REPRESENTS ABOUT 25 RURAL
- 24 COUNTIES, FOUND THROUGH A SURVEY OF THEIR MEMBERS
- 25 IN 1994 THAT ONE OF THE TWO MOST IMPORTANT ISSUES

- 1 FOR THEM WAS COORDINATED WASTE DIVERSION AND
- 2 MARKETING ARRANGEMENTS.
- 3 FINALLY, IN 1995 IN A REPORT TO THE
- 4 LEGISLATURE ON RURAL ISSUES, THE BOARD AGAIN
- 5 IDENTIFIED THE NEED TO STUDY THE APPLICABILITY OF
- 6 COOPERATIVE MARKETING. AS A RESULT, THE BOARD
- 7 DIRECTED STAFF TO STUDY THE FEASIBILITY OF A
- 8 STATEWIDE RURAL MARKETING COOPERATIVE IN MARCH OF
- 9 1995. THE PURPOSE OF THE BOARD'S STUDY WAS TO
- 10 DETERMINE IF RURAL JURISDICTIONS COULD BENEFIT
- 11 FROM A STATEWIDE MARKETING COOPERATIVE. AND THIS
- 12 MEANT FINDING OUT HOW MANY JURISDICTIONS WERE
- 13 INTERESTED IN COOPERATIVELY MARKETING USABLE
- 14 MATERIALS WHICH COULD NOT BE ECONOMICALLY
- 15 COLLECTED, PROCESSED, TRANSPORTED, OR MARKETED

BY

- 16 A SINGLE JURISDICTION.
- 17 IT ALSO MEANT ANALYZING THE

ECONOMIC

- 18 FEASIBILITY OF A STATEWIDE COOPERATIVE WHICH CAN
- 19 SERVE RURAL JURISDICTIONS THROUGHOUT CALIFORNIA.
- 20 IF STATEWIDE COOPERATIVE MARKETING WERE

DETERMINED

- 21 TO BE FEASIBLE, THEN OUR STAFF WOULD MAKE RECOM-
- 22 MENDATIONS ABOUT HOW TO FUND AND ORGANIZE SUCH A

- 23 COOPERATIVE.
- 24 BEFORE I DISCUSS WHAT WE'VE
- 25 ACCOMPLISHED, I'D LIKE TO DESCRIBE WHAT THE BOARD

- 1 DID NOT INTEND TO DO WITH THIS STUDY. THE FIRST
- 2 WAS THAT THE BOARD DID NOT WANT TO COMPETE WITH
- 3 THE PRIVATE SECTOR. THE SECOND, THE BOARD DID NOT
- 4 WANT TO ENCOURAGE HIGH-GRADING OF THE BEST
- 5 MATERIALS. AND THIRD, THE BOARD DID NOT WANT TO
- 6 ACTUALLY OPERATE A COOPERATIVE.
- 7 IN ORDER TO HELP GUIDE THIS STUDY,
- 8 WE INITIALLY FORMED A STEERING COMMITTEE, AND THIS
- 9 COMMITTEE WAS COMPRISED OF STAFF FROM WITHIN THE
- 10 BOARD AND INCLUDED INTERESTED OUTSIDE PARTIES.
- 11 STAFF FROM WITHIN THE BOARD WERE FROM THE OFFICE
- 12 OF LOCAL ASSISTANCE, THE MARKET ANALYSIS AND
- 13 SERVICES SECTION, THE RMDZ PROGRAM, THE R-TEAM,
- 14 AND THE ECONOMIC FORECASTING SECTION.
- 15 OUTSIDE PARTIES INCLUDED A RURAL
- 16 COUNTY STAFF PERSON FROM EL DORADO COUNTY, A RURAL
- 17 COUNTY SUPERVISOR FROM PLUMAS COUNTY, A RURAL
- 18 HAULER AND RECYCLER FROM THE SOUTH TAHOE REFUSE
- 19 COMPANY, THE CALIFORNIA REFUSE REMOVAL COUNCIL,
- THE UCD CENTER FOR COOPERATIVE, AND A STAFF

PERSON

- 21 FROM THE OFFICE OF TRADE AND COMMERCE.
- WHAT HAVE WE ACCOMPLISHED?

FIRST,

23 STAFF VISITED RECYCLING FACILITIES, SMALL

MANUFAC-

- TURING COMPANIES, AND COOPERATIVE INTERESTS
- 25 THROUGHOUT RURAL CALIFORNIA. STAFF ALSO

- 1 RESEARCHED 64 RECYCLING COOPERATIVES THROUGHOUT
- 2 THE UNITED STATES AND CANADA AND THE ONLY RURAL
- 3 COOPERATIVE IN CALIFORNIA TO IDENTIFY THE
- 4 CHARACTERISTICS OF SUCCESSFUL COOPERATIVES.
- 5 STAFF SENT AN INITIAL SURVEY TO 129
- 6 RURAL CITIES AND COUNTIES. THAT'S 95 CITIES AND
- 7 34 COUNTIES WITH POPULATIONS UNDER 200,000. THIS
- 8 SURVEY WAS DESIGNED TO SOLICIT INDICATIONS OF
- 9 INTEREST IN COOPERATIVE MARKETING.
- 10 STAFF SENT A FOLLOW-UP SURVEY TO 66
- 11 JURISDICTIONS WHO INDICATED A WILLINGNESS TO
- 12 PARTICIPATE IN COOPERATIVE MARKETING PROGRAMS.
- 13 STAFF ALSO CO-AUTHORED AN ARTICLE IN "CALIFORNIA
- 14 COUNTY MAGAZINE, " DESCRIBING THE BOARD'S EFFORTS
- 15 TO ASSIST RURAL COUNTIES TO MEET THE WASTE DIVER-
- 16 SION REQUIREMENTS THROUGH COOPERATIVE MARKETING.
- 17 STAFF IDENTIFIED A NUMBER OF
- 18 POSSIBLE FUNDING SOURCES FOR COOPERATIVES. AND
- 19 FINALLY, STAFF CONDUCTED RESEARCH ON THE
- 20 AVAILABILITY AND QUALITY OF EXISTING WASTE
- 21 COMPOSITION DATA FOR THE PURPOSE OF DETERMINING
- 22 THE TYPE AND AMOUNT OF MATERIALS WHICH MIGHT BE
- 23 AVAILABLE FOR RECYCLING THROUGH A COOPERATIVE.
- 24 WHAT DID WE FIND? WE FOUND THAT
- 25 MANY RURAL JURISDICTIONS THROUGHOUT CALIFORNIA

ARE

- 1 INTERESTED IN THE CONCEPT. FORTY-NINE CITIES AND
- 2 17 COUNTIES -- THAT'S ABOUT 50 PERCENT OF THOSE
- 3 JURISDICTIONS WE SURVEYED -- WERE INTERESTED IN
- 4 THE CONCEPT. FIFTY PERCENT OF THOSE JURISDICTIONS
- 5 NEEDED HELP IN MARKETING LOW VALUE MATERIALS LIKE
- 6 TIRES, BIOMASS, AND PLASTICS. AND MORE THAN A
- 7 THIRD OF THOSE NEEDED HELP IN MARKETING ALL OF
- 8 THEIR MATERIALS.
- 9 OUR RESEARCH AND THE RESEARCH
- 10 CONDUCTED BY THE COOPERATIVE MARKETING NETWORK,
- 11 THE MINNESOTA PROJECT, THE TENNESSEE VALLEY
- 12 AUTHORITY, THE U.S. EPA, AND THE ARCATA RECYCLING
- 13 ASSOCIATION, AMONG OTHERS, IDENTIFIED THE
- 14 FOLLOWING CHARACTERISTICS OF SUCCESSFUL
- 15 COOPERATIVES. THEY ARE TO PROJECT VOLUMES OF
- 16 SPECIFIC MATERIALS IN THE WASTESTREAM AND ARE
- 17 BASED ON SOUND BUSINESS PRINCIPLES. THEY INCLUDE
- 18 PUBLIC EDUCATION PROGRAMS AND HAVE LOTS OF
- 19 COMMUNITY SUPPORT. THEY USUALLY INCLUDE START-UP
- 20 GRANTS, PLANNING ASSISTANCE FROM A REGIONAL OR
- 21 STATE AGENCY, ANCILLARY COLLECTION PROGRAMS, VALUE
- 22 ADDED OR INTERMEDIATE PROCESSING LIKE WASHING,
- 23 SORTING, OR BALING, QUALITY CONTROL, PUBLIC/
- 24 PRIVATE PARTNERSHIPS, AND BRAND NAME RECOGNITION.
- 25 THE MOST SUCCESSFUL COOPERATIVE

- 1 PROGRAMS MAKE GOOD USE OF EXISTING LOCAL RESOURCES
- 2 SUCH AS EXISTING RECYCLING CENTERS, COLLECTION AND
- 3 PROCESSING EQUIPMENT, HOST ORGANIZATIONS, AND
- 4 FUNDING SOURCES. THE MOST SUCCESSFUL COOPERATIVE
- 5 PROGRAMS ALSO MAKE THE BEST MATCHES BETWEEN THE
- 6 SERVICES PROVIDED AND THE NEEDS OF THE LOCAL
- 7 PARTICIPANTS. FOR EXAMPLE, VERY RURAL COMMUNITIES
- 8 AND NEW RECYCLING PROGRAMS CAN BENEFIT FROM ACCESS
- 9 TO COLLECTION AND PROCESSING EQUIPMENT.
- 10 ESTABLISHED RECYCLING PROGRAMS, ON THE OTHER HAND,
- 11 ARE BETTER ABLE TO USE MARKETING SERVICES THAT
- 12 BROKER AND SHIP MATERIAL. NEW COOPERATIVES WITH
- 13 LESS THAN FIVE-MEMBER JURISDICTIONS ARE MORE
- 14 LIKELY TO BE SUCCESSFUL THAN LARGER COOPERATIVES.
- 15 FINALLY, THE TWO MOST SIGNIFICANT
- 16 OBSTACLES TO SUCCESSFUL COOPERATIVE DEVELOPMENT
- 17 ARE COMPETING LOCAL INTERESTS AND LACK OF
- 18 RESOURCES, PRIMARILY LONG-TERM FUNDING.
- 19 INITIALLY, IN ORDER TO AVOID
- 20 DUPLICATION OF EFFORT, STAFF FELT IT WAS IMPORTANT
- 21 TO DRAW ON THE EXPERIENCES OF EXISTING COOPERA-
- 22 TIVES SUCH AS THE SOUTHWEST PUBLIC RECYCLING
- 23 ASSOCIATION, OR SPRA, THE ARCATA COMMUNITY
- 24 RECYCLING ASSOCIATION, AND STAFF EXPERTISE AT

THE

25 UC DAVIS CENTER FOR COOPERATIVES. SINCE SPRA

- 1 SUCCESSFULLY IMPLEMENTED RURAL COOPERATIVE
- 2 MARKETING ACROSS A MULTISTATE REGION, IT SEEMED
- 3 REASONABLE TO CONDUCT A STATEWIDE STUDY. THIS
- 4 WOULD ALSO MAKE THE MOST EFFICIENT USE OF LIMITED
- 5 BOARD STAFF AND RESOURCES. HOWEVER, IT IS STAFF'S
- 6 CONCLUSION THAT A NEW STATEWIDE RURAL MARKETING
- 7 COOPERATIVE IS NOT LIKELY TO BE SUCCESSFUL EVEN
- 8 THOUGH MANY RURAL JURISDICTIONS MIGHT BE
- 9 INTERESTED IN PARTICIPATING.
- 10 FURTHERMORE, IT IS NOT POSSIBLE TO
- 11 DETERMINE THE ECONOMIC FEASIBILITY OF SUCH A
- 12 COOPERATIVE WITH ANY NUMERICAL PRECISION GIVEN THE
- 13 LACK OF CURRENT AND RELIABLE DATA ON THE
- 14 WASTESTREAM. STAFF'S EXTENSIVE RESEARCH,
- 15 DISCUSSIONS WITH EXPERTS, AND VISITS WITH RURAL
- 16 RECYCLERS, SUCH AS THE ARCATA COMMUNITY RECYCLING
- 17 ASSOCIATION, INDICATE THAT A ONE-SIZE-FITS-ALL
- 18 SOLUTION FOR STATEWIDE COOPERATIVE MAY NOT BE THE
- 19 BEST APPROACH.
- 20 SO STAFF IDENTIFIED SEVERAL OPTIONS.
- 21 THE FIRST WAS TO DISCONTINUE THE STUDY OF COOPERA-
- 22 TIVE MARKETING. THE SECOND WAS TO EXPLORE WHETHER
- 23 A SMALLER SCALE REGIONAL FEASIBILITY STUDY OF
- 24 COOPERATIVE MARKETING COULD BE ACCOMPLISHED WITH
- 25 THE BOARD'S EXISTING STAFF AND RESOURCES. AND THE

- 1 THIRD OPTION WAS PURSUE A CONTRACT FOR A REGIONAL
- 2 FEASIBILITY STUDY. AND IT IS EXPECTED THAT
- 3 SUCH -- IT WOULD BE EXPECTED THAT SUCH A CONTRACT
- 4 CONCEPT WOULD BE PART OF THE BOARD'S NORMAL
- 5 CONTRACT REVIEW PROCESS.
- 6 STAFF ARE RECOMMENDING OPTION NO. 3.
- 7 STAFF'S RESEARCH INDICATES THAT USING A MULTISTATE
- 8 MODEL MAY NOT BE APPROPRIATE FOR CALIFORNIA.
- 9 CALIFORNIA'S MANY RURAL JURISDICTIONS DIFFER
- 10 SIGNIFICANTLY IN GEOGRAPHY, DEMOGRAPHICS, AND
- 11 ECONOMICS. SOME JURISDICTIONS ARE ALREADY
- 12 COOPERATING IN DIFFERENT WAYS ON A SMALL SCALE.
- 13 SPRA WAS FORMED BY 20 LARGE CITIES,
- 14 INCLUDING THE CITIES OF TUCSON AND PHOENIX, AND
- 15 DOESN'T REALLY PROVIDE A RELEVANT EXAMPLE OF HOW
- 16 SMALL RURAL COMMUNITIES CAN OVERCOME LOCAL
- 17 POLITICAL ISSUES AND FUNDING LIMITATIONS IN ORDER
- 18 TO START COOPERATIVELY DIVERTING MATERIAL.
- 19 IN ADDITION, INDEPENDENT RESEARCH
- 20 SHOWS THAT COOPERATIVES COMPRISED OF LESS THAN
- 21 FIVE MEMBERS ARE MOST LIKELY TO BE SUCCESSFUL. A
- 22 SMALL OR REGIONAL COOPERATIVE WOULD BE MORE LIKELY
- 23 TO SUCCEED THAN A STATEWIDE COOPERATIVE.
- 24 STAFF ARE, THEREFORE, RECOMMENDING
- 25 AN ADDITIONAL REGIONAL STUDY. THIS APPROACH COULD

- 1 TAKE A NUMBER OF FORMS, BUT STAFF ENVISIONS THIS
 2 STUDY INVOLVING SEVERAL CONTIGUOUS OR NEARBY
- 3 JURISDICTIONS WHO ARE WILLING AND ABLE TO
- 4 PARTICIPATE AND PARTNERSHIP WITH THE BOARD,
- 5 PERHAPS IN AN RMDZ. IT IS EXPECTED THAT SUCH A
- 6 SMALLER SCALE STUDY WOULD TAKE ABOUT A YEAR.
- 7 FOCUSING ON A SMALLER AREA OR REGION
- 8 WOULD MAKE IT EASIER TO COLLECT CURRENT AND
- 9 ACCURATE INFORMATION FIRSTHAND ABOUT POTENTIALLY
- 10 MARKETABLE MATERIALS IN THE WASTESTREAM. IN
- 11 ADDITION, THE BOARD'S WASTE CHARACTERIZATION
- 12 DEFAULT DATABASE COULD BE USED TO ENHANCE OR
- 13 SUPPLEMENT THIS FIELD RESEARCH WHEN THE DATABASE
- 14 BECOMES AVAILABLE IN EARLY 1997.
- 15 GIVEN BOARD STAFF'S INCREASING
- 16 WORKLOAD AND THE LACK OF LOCAL RESOURCES,

CONTRACT

- 17 FUNDING WOULD BE NECESSARY TO SUPPLEMENT STAFF
- AND
- 18 LOCAL RESOURCES. WE BELIEVE A REGIONAL STUDY OF
- 19 COOPERATIVE MARKETING SHOULD PRODUCE A MODEL
- 20 FEASIBILITY STUDY FOR USE BY RURAL JURISDICTIONS
- 21 THROUGHOUT CALIFORNIA.
- 22 THAT CONCLUDES MY PRESENTATION.

AND

23 I AND KIT STYCKET WOULD BE HAPPY TO ANSWER

- QUESTIONS AND LORRAINE TOO, I'M SURE, IF YOU HAVE
- 25 ANY QUESTIONS OR SUGGESTIONS FOR US.

1	CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: OKAY. QUESTIONS OF
2	STAFF AT THIS POINT?
3	I'VE HAD THE CHANCE TO HEAR SEVERAL
4	PRESENTATIONS BY THE SOUTHWEST PUBLIC RECYCLING
5	ASSOCIATION STAFF, AND THEY'VE MADE A REMARKABLE
6	GO OF IT, I THINK, GIVEN THE LARGE GEOGRAPHIC
7	REGION AND THE DIVERSITY OF JURISDICTIONS THAT
8	THEY SERVE. THEY HAVE RUN UP AGAINST THE PROBLEM
9	OF THE JURISDICTIONS TENDING TO TURN TO THE
10	REGIONAL MARKETING FOR THE MATERIALS THAT ARE HARD
11	TO GET RID OF. AND, OF COURSE, THE PROFITS GET
12	TAKEN REAL EASILY ON A LOCAL BASIS, BUT THE LOW
13	VALUE MATERIALS ARE THE ONES THAT SPRA USUALLY
14	WINDS UP TRYING TO DEAL WITH. AND THEY CONTINUE
15	TO STRUGGLE IN TERMS OF THE FINANCIAL RESOURCES.
16	I THINK FROM A BUSINESS STANDPOINT,
17	THE IDEA OF IT BEING OPERATED LIKE A BUSINESS
18	WHERE YOU ESSENTIALLY WOULD PAY A BROKERAGE FEE IN
19	ORDER TO HELP COVER THE COST OF AN ASSOCIATION
20	LIKE THAT MAKES SENSE IF THE JURISDICTIONS ARE
21	REALLY WILLING TO TURN ALL THE MATERIALS OVER, NOT
22	JUST THE ONES THAT HAVE NO VALUE OR HAVE NEGATIVE
23	VALUE, AND ASK THE REGIONAL GROUP TO TRY TO DEAL
24 25	WITH THOSE LOW VALUE MATERIALS. AS FAR AS THE QUESTION OF WHERE TO

- 1 GO FROM HERE, I HAVE SEVERAL IDEAS. ONE IS THAT
- 2 I'M NOT REALLY INTERESTED IN SPENDING RESOURCES ON
- 3 STUDIES, IF ON THE OUTSIDE CHANCE WE HAVE ANY
- 4 ADDITIONAL CONTRACT MONIES AVAILABLE, AND I DO
- 5 THINK WE SHOULD PUT THIS CONCEPT IN LINE WITH THE
- 6 OTHER COMPETING PROPOSALS, IT SHOULD BE FOR SOME
- 7 SORT OF A DEMONSTRATION OR PILOT AS OPPOSED TO
- 8 JUST FURTHER STUDY, BUT I AGREE WITH THE IDEA OF
- 9 SMALL-SCALE PARTLY BECAUSE I CAN'T IMAGINE THE
- 10 RESOURCES TO TRY TO ESTABLISH SOMETHING LIKE SPRA.
- 11 I ALSO THINK THAT WE OUGHT TO
- 12 CONTINUE TO BE -- WE MEANING YOU, OUR STAFF --
- 13 OUGHT TO CONTINUE TO BE AVAILABLE FOR TECHNICAL
- 14 ASSISTANCE TO ANY GROUP THAT'S INTERESTED IN
- 15 PURSUING THIS, TO COOPERATE WITH THEM AND ALSO
- 16 PERHAPS TO BE A CO-APPLICANT FOR GRANT MONIES
- 17 EITHER TO FOUNDATIONS OR FEDERAL AGENCIES OR OTHER
- 18 STATE AGENCIES TO BOOST THE PROSPECTS OF A GROUP
- 19 OF JURISDICTIONS GETTING FUNDS FROM SOURCES THAT
- 20 MIGHT BE MORE READILY AVAILABLE.
- 21 THOSE ARE SOME OF THE IDEAS THAT
- 22 COME TO MIND. AND WE DO HAVE A REQUEST TO ADDRESS
- 23 THE COMMITTEE BY MR. EVAN EDGAR, REPRESENTING
- 24 CRRC.
- 25 MR. EDGAR: GOOD MORNING. MY NAME IS

- 1 EVAN EDGAR. I'M THE MANAGER OF REGULATORY AFFAIRS
- 2 FOR THE CALIFORNIA REFUSE REMOVAL COUNCIL.
- 3 I'M HERE TODAY TO SUPPORT OPTION 3.
- 4 I'VE BEEN INVOLVED WITH THIS STUDY FOR THE LAST
- 5 TWO TO THREE YEARS, AND I REALLY APPRECIATE THE
- 6 OUTREACH EFFORT BY MR. NUFFER TO GO TO THE FIELD,
- 7 COLLECT INFORMATION, AND TO PARTICIPATE WITH GOING
- 8 TO DIFFERENT REGIONS TO COLLECT INFORMATION.
- 9 I'M HERE TODAY TO UPDATE THIS
- 10 COMMITTEE ON WHAT'S GOING ON IN THE SIERRA NEVADA
- 11 GROUP, RCRC. I WAS ABLE TO PRESENT THIS MATERIAL
- 12 TO RCRC BACK IN AUGUST OF '95 AND AGAIN TO THE
- 13 WASTE BOARD, FULL BOARD HEARING IN PLACERVILLE ON
- 14 SEPTEMBER 28, 1995. SINCE THAT TIME WE'VE
- 15 PERMITTED ADDITIONAL MRF CAPACITY IN THE SIERRA
- 16 NEVADAS. EL DORADO MRF WAS PERMITTED AS WELL AS
- 17 AMADOR, AND WE'RE CONTINUING ON IN THAT REGION.
- 18 I THINK WITH MANY REGIONS OF
- 19 CALIFORNIA WITH ITS BIOREGION, WE'RE ABLE TO HAVE
- 20 A LOT OF SUCCESS STORIES ON PRIVATIZATION, ON
- 21 RURAL COOPERATIVE MARKETING IN THE SUBTITLE D ERA.
- I PRESENTED THIS INFORMATION BEFORE AND WE'RE
- 23 BUILDING UPON THAT.
- 24 THE REASON WE SUPPORT OPTION NO. 3
- 25 IS I THINK MR. NUFFER POINTED OUT THERE'S MANY

- 1 DIFFERENT REGIONS OF CALIFORNIA. WHEREAS, SIERRA
- 2 NEVADA GROUP MAY BE A MODEL FOR THAT REGION, UP IN
- 3 INYO, UP IN NORTH STATE, NORTH COAST, IT'S A
- 4 DIFFERENT TYPE OF SOLUTION, DIFFERENT TYPE OF
- 5 ANSWERS UP THERE. I THINK A FEASIBILITY STUDY
- 6 WOULD BE VERY BENEFICIAL.
- 7 ONE ASPECT OF THE LAST EFFORTS TO
- 8 LOOK AT COOPERATIVE MARKETING, I FELT IT WENT
- 9 BEYOND JUST REGIONAL COOPERATIVE MARKETING
- 10 ACTIVITY. THE LAST REPORTS THAT WAS PUT OUT A
- 11 YEAR AGO GOT INTO OPERATIONAL ISSUES, OPERATIONAL
- 12 ACQUISITION OF PROCESSING EQUIPMENT, BUYING
- 13 TRUCKS, GOING OUT THERE BUYING EQUIPMENT. AND
- 14 THAT TREND AT THAT TIME CRRC TESTIFIED ABOUT, THAT
- 15 WAS NOT THE ENVELOPE OF RURAL COOPERATIVE
- 16 MARKETING TO GET INTO PURCHASING PROCESSING
- 17 EQUIPMENT AND HAULING EQUIPMENT BECAUSE ON THE
- 18 PRIVATE SIDE WE'RE DOING THAT RIGHT NOW. IF IT
- 19 WAS JUST LIMITED TO RURAL COOPERATIVE MARKETING ON
- 20 RECYCLABLE MATERIALS AND BROKERING MATERIALS,
- 21 THAT'S GREAT. WE WOULD SUPPORT THE FEASIBILITY
- 22 STUDY. BUT THE SECOND IT GETS INTO OTHER ISSUES
- 23 OF OPERATIONAL ISSUES OF BUYING EQUIPMENT, THAT'S
- 24 WHERE WE WOULD HAVE CONCERNS.
- 25 I BELIEVE SOME OF THOSE CONCERNS

- 1 WILL BE VOICED ON THURSDAY, THE 23D, WITH REGARDS
- 2 TO THE 50-PERCENT INITIATIVE. THERE ARE SOME
- 3 IDEAS INSIDE OF THERE ABOUT HAVING GENERAL
- 4 SERVICES BUYING A LOT OF PROCESSING EQUIPMENT AND
- 5 SELLING IT AT A DISCOUNT PRICE TO LOCAL JURIS-
- 6 DICTIONS.
- 7 SO WITHIN THAT FRAMEWORK THERE'S A
- 8 WHOLE ANOTHER ISSUE THAT WE'LL BE DISCUSSING

ABOUT

- 9 IN THE 50-PERCENT INITIATIVE. BUT TODAY'S ISSUE
- 10 ABOUT RURAL COOPERATIVE MARKETING, I THINK THE
- 11 STUDY WOULD BE GREAT, AND WE'LL BE INVOLVED WITH
- 12 THAT STUDY AND BEING USING THE SIERRA NEVADA

GROUP

- 13 AS A MODEL ACTIVITY IN ORDER TO FOLLOW IN OTHER
- 14 REGIONS OF CALIFORNIA. THANK YOU.
- 15 CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: WHILE YOU ARE UP
- 16 THERE, EVAN, ON THE SUBJECT OF THE ROLE OF A
- 17 COOPERATIVE MARKETING ORGANIZATION OR ASSOCIATION
- 18 OR WHATEVER VEHICLE IT MIGHT TAKE, MY UNDER-
- 19 STANDING WITH SOUTHWEST RECYCLING ASSOCIATION IS
- 20 THAT THE ISSUE -- THEY DON'T ACTUALLY OPERATE THE
- 21 PROCESSING, BUT THEY DO TRY TO GET SOME SORT OF
- Α,
- 22 AMONGST THOSE WHO WANT TO PARTICIPATE FOR A
- 23 PARTICULAR MATERIAL, THEY DO TRY TO SET A CERTAIN

- 24 PROCESSING STANDARD SO THAT IF THEY'RE MARKETING
- ON BEHALF OF THOSE MULTIPLE OPERATIONS OR

- 1 FACILITIES OR JURISDICTIONS, THEY CAN GO TO A
- 2 PAPER COMPANY OR A BROKER AND SAY HERE'S HOW MUCH
- 3 TONNAGE I CAN PROVIDE YOU AT X QUALITY LEVEL. OR
- 4 THE BROKER SAYS HERE'S THE QUALITY LEVEL I NEED,
- 5 CAN YOU GO BACK AND GUARANTEE ME THAT ALL THESE
- 6 PROVIDERS CAN PROVIDE THAT QUALITY LEVEL. SO I
- 7 THINK THAT THAT'S PROBABLY THE ISSUE.
- 8 AND, OF COURSE, YOU KNOW, AND I
- 9 THINK YOUR MEMBERS CAN HELP PROVIDE THIS FUNCTION,
- 10 BUT A LOT OF TIMES DECENTRALIZED PROCESSING IS
- 11 IMPORTANT FOR LOW VALUE MATERIALS IN TERMS OF
- 12 GETTING THEM TO MARKET BECAUSE OF THE FACT THAT
- 13 YOU'RE SHIPPING AIR IF YOU'RE NOT SHIPPING PROCESS
- 14 MATERIALS. BUT I THINK THAT IT DOESN'T HAVE TO BE
- 15 UNDER THE WING OF -- DOESN'T HAVE TO BE DONE BY
- 16 THE CENTRALIZED COOPERATIVE ASSOCIATION. IT'S
- 17 MORE A QUESTION OF TO WHAT THE DEGREE THE
- 18 DIFFERENT ENTITIES ARE GOING TO WORK TOGETHER TO
- 19 AGREE TO STANDARDS SO THAT THEY CAN MAXIMIZE THE
- 20 VALUE OF WHAT THEY'RE GENERATING.
- 21 MR. EDGAR: IN TODAY'S MARKETPLACE YOU
- 22 HAVE THOSE SAME STANDARDS THAT WE ARE ADHERING TO
- 23 IN THE MARKETPLACE. WE HAVE MANY SIMILAR BROKERS
- 24 SERVICING ITS 13 DIFFERENT MEMBERS IN THE MRF'S

25 IN THE SIERRA NEVADAS. SO WE DO HAVE STANDARDS;

- 1 WE DO LOOK AT THE GROUP MARKETING WHEN WE HAVE
- 2 SIMILAR BROKERS SERVICING THOSE BALED MATERIALS
- 3 FROM OUR MRF'S. SO THAT'S CURRENTLY GOING ON, AND
- 4 WE RESPECT THE MARKETPLACE BECAUSE WE HAVE TO
- 5 COMPETE WITH OTHER PEOPLE SUPPLYING THE SECONDARY
- 6 MATERIALS. SO WE DEFINITELY APPRECIATE THAT
- 7 CONCEPT, TO HAVE SOME TYPE OF STANDARD THAT
- 8 EVERYBODY UNDERSTANDS.
- 9 CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: THANKS FOR YOUR INPUT.
- 10 MR. EDGAR: THANK YOU.
- 11 CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: ANY QUESTIONS OR
- 12 COMMENTS?
- 13 MY SUGGESTION IS THAT WE ASK STAFF
- 14 TO DEVELOP A CONTRACT CONCEPT FOR THE 1997-98
- 15 CONTRACT CONCEPTS PROCESS FOR CONSIDERATION ALONG
- 16 WITH OTHER CONTRACT IDEAS. I'M INTERESTED IN
- 17 GOING BEYOND JUST FEASIBILITY STUDIES PERSONALLY.
- AS WILL COME UP REPEATEDLY WITH THE
- 19 50-PERCENT ITEM AND OTHERS, THERE'S A CLOCK
- 20 TICKING, I HEAR, DAY AND NIGHT IN TERMS OF THE
- 21 YEAR 2000 LOOMING. AND SO TO THE EXTENT WE CAN
- 22 MAKE THINGS HAPPEN MORE QUICKLY, I THINK THAT'S
- 23 BECOMING CRITICAL. SO IF FUNDS HAPPEN TO BE
- 24 AVAILABLE, I WOULD LIKE TO SEE US BE FUNDING THE
- 25 IMPLEMENTATION OF -- INITIAL IMPLEMENTATION STEPS

- 1 OF ESTABLISHING A COOPERATIVE AS A PILOT PROJECT
- 2 OR A MODEL.
- 3 AND ALSO DIRECT STAFF TO BE
- 4 AVAILABLE FOR TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND CONSIDER-
- 5 ATION OF GRANT APPLICATION COSPONSORSHIP AS OTHER
- 6 WAYS THAT WE COULD SUPPORT NOT JUST ONE BUT ANY
- 7 NUMBER OF POSSIBLE REGIONAL COOPERATIVE MARKETING
- 8 EFFORTS.
- 9 DOES THAT CONCUR WITH WHAT YOU WOULD
- 10 LIKE TO SEE?
- 11 MEMBER GOTCH: YEAH.
- 12 CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: AND I GUESS --
- MS. VAN KEKERIX: IF I CAN MAKE ONE
- 14 COMMENT. ONE OF THE REASONS THAT WE HAD FOCUSED
- 15 ON THE FEASIBILITY STUDY IS IF WE'RE LOOKING AT A
- 16 SMALLER NUMBER, WE WOULD LIKE TO HAVE A TOOL THAT
- 17 OTHER JURISDICTIONS WHO ARE OUTSIDE OF THIS
- 18 SMALLER REGIONAL STUDY WOULD HAVE AVAILABLE TO
- 19 THEM TO USE. SO WE WOULD HAVE A PRODUCT COMING
- 20 OUT OF THIS CONTRACT THAT WOULD BE AVAILABLE FOR
- 21 OTHER PEOPLE TO USE RATHER THAN NOT HAVING THAT
- 22 KIND OF PRODUCT AVAILABLE.
- 23 CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: I GUESS I'D RATHER
- 24 FOCUS ON A MODEL RATHER THAN A STUDY FROM THE
- 25 STANDPOINT OF SOMETHING THAT I THINK IS MORE

- 1 OUICKLY TRANSFERABLE BECAUSE IT'S BEEN
- 2 DEMONSTRATED AS OPPOSED TO JUST LOOKING AT WHAT-
- 3 IFS AND CONTINUING TO STUDY. I WANT TO MAKE SURE
- 4 THAT SOME IMPLEMENTATION STEPS ARE WHAT WE'RE
- 5 TRYING --
- 6 MS. VAN KEKERIX: PERHAPS WE DIDN'T STATE
- 7 IT CLEARLY. WHAT WE HOPED WOULD COME OUT WOULD BE
- 8 A MODEL THAT OTHER PEOPLE COULD USE.
- 9 CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: SOUNDS LIKE WE'RE
- 10 TALKING ABOUT THE SAME THING.
- 11 MR. NUFFER: I THINK WE ARE.
- 12 CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: OKAY. SO I'LL
- 13 ENTERTAIN A MOTION. DOES THIS NEED TO GO TO THE
- 14 BOARD, OR IS THIS JUST DIRECTION TO STAFF? I MEAN
- 15 WE'RE NOT OBVIOUSLY APPROVING A CONTRACT CONCEPT.
- 16 IT'S JUST FOR A CONTRACT CONCEPT TO BE IN THE
- 17 PROCESS THAT WOULD EVENTUALLY BE DECIDED ON BY THE
- 18 BOARD. SO I'M NOT SURE IT REQUIRES BOARD
- 19 CONSIDERATION. SO WE'LL JUST CONSIDER IT
- 20 DIRECTION TO STAFF. AND DID I HEAR YOU MOVE IT?
- 21 MEMBER GOTCH: I MOVED IT, YES, I DID.
- 22 CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: DID I HEAR A SECOND?
- 23 MEMBER FRAZEE: SECOND.
- 24 CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: IT'S BEEN MOVED AND
- 25 SECONDED. WE WILL SUBSTITUTE THE PRIOR ROLL

CALL,

- 1 AND THE MOTION CARRIES THREE ZERO. AND I
- 2 APPRECIATE THE EFFORT. IT WAS A VERY INTERESTING
- 3 REPORT.
- 4 THE NEXT ITEM IS ITEM 21, WHICH IS
- 5 CONSIDERATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS FOR CHANGES TO
- 6 THE USED OIL RECYCLING BLOCK GRANTS.
- 7 MS. VAN KEKERIX: AND AMONG THE
- 8 ACTIVITIES THAT ARE MANDATED BY THE CALIFORNIA

OIL

- 9 RECYCLING ENHANCEMENT ACT ARE ANNUAL BLOCK GRANTS
- 10 TO CITIES AND COUNTIES FOR IMPLEMENTATION OF THE
- 11 LOCAL USED OIL COLLECTION PROGRAM. THE PURPOSE

OF

- 12 TODAY'S ITEM IS TO RECOMMEND CHANGES TO THE BLOCK
- 13 GRANT CYCLE THAT WILL STREAMLINE THE PROCESS AND
- 14 IMPROVE THE EFFECTIVENESS OF THE PROGRAM FOR

LOCAL

- 15 GOVERNMENT. AND SHIRLEY WILLD-WAGNER, THE
- 16 SUPERVISOR OF THE GRANTS AND HOUSEHOLD HAZARDOUS
- 17 WASTE SECTION, WILL BE MAKING THIS PRESENTATION.
- 18 MS. WILLD-WAGNER: MORNING, MR. CHAIRMAN
- 19 AND COMMITTEE MEMBERS. AS LORRAINE OUTLINED, THE
- 20 PURPOSE OF TODAY'S ITEM IS TO RECOMMEND SOME
- 21 CHANGES TO THE BLOCK GRANT PROGRAM. THE IMPETUS
- 22 BEHIND THE ITEM IS TO REALLY INCREASE OUR LEVEL

- 23 SERVICE TO LOCAL GOVERNMENTS.
- AS A WAY OF BACKGROUND, BLOCK

GRANTS

25 ARE NONCOMPETITIVE GRANTS. THEY'RE BASICALLY

- 1 ENTITLEMENT GRANTS. THE STATUTE CLEARLY LAYS OUT
- 2 AN ALLOCATION FORMULA SO THAT EACH JURISDICTION
- 3 RECEIVES A BLOCK GRANT ALLOCATION BASED ON THE
- 4 PERCENTAGE OF THEIR POPULATION IN RELATION TO THE
- 5 STATE'S POPULATION. THROUGH THE FOUR CYCLES

WE'VE

- 6 HAD SO FAR, IT'S WORKED OUT TO ABOUT 31 CENTS PER
- 7 RESIDENT.
- 8 TODAY STAFF IS REQUESTING COMMITTEE
- 9 ON THREE SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS, AND I'M GOING
- 10 TO GO THROUGH THOSE ONE BY ONE. THE FIRST IS TO
- 11 EXTEND THE TERM OF THE GRANT AGREEMENT FROM ONE
- 12 YEAR TO THREE YEARS. THIS IS REALLY DONE TO
- 13 INCREASE THE FLEXIBILITY FOR LOCAL GOVERNMENTS

AND

- 14 ASSIST IN LONG-TERM PLANNING. MANY JURISDICTIONS
- 15 HAD TROUBLES EXPENDING THE TOTAL DOLLARS OF THEIR
- 16 ALLOCATION WITHIN THE TIME FRAME. IT'S KIND OF

AN

17 ARBITRARY TIME FRAME, JUNE 1ST TO JULY -- JULY

1ST

- 18 TO JUNE 30TH. EVERY YEAR THEY NEED TO COMPLETELY
- 19 CLOSE OUT THEIR BOOKS, SUBMIT DOCUMENTATION, AND
- 20 END ONE GRANT CYCLE, BEGIN THE NEXT.
- 21 BY MOVING TO A THREE-YEAR CYCLE,
- 22 THEY'LL BE ABLE TO ROLL OVER ANY UNEXPENDED FUNDS

FROM THE FIRST-YEAR CYCLE INTO THE SECOND YEAR,

PERHAPS PRODUCE MORE ADDITIONAL PROGRAMS. AND
HOPEFULLY THE SMALL AGENCIES ESPECIALLY MAY END
UP

- 1 ACTUALLY SAVING THEIR MONIES IN THEIR ALLOCATIONS
- 2 FROM THE FIRST YEAR OR TWO AND PROVIDING

SOMETHING

- 3 MORE PERMANENT IN THE WAY OF SOLUTIONS TO THE USED
- 4 OIL COLLECTION PROGRAMS IN THE SECOND- AND THIRD-
- 5 YEAR CYCLE. SO WE REALLY FEEL THIS WILL HELP
- 6 JURISDICTIONS, AS WELL AS REDUCE SOME OF THE
- 7 WORKLOAD, BOTH FOR LOCAL JURISDICTIONS AND CIWMB
- 8 STAFF.
- 9 THE SECOND RECOMMENDATION IS TO
- 10 ESTABLISH MINIMUM BLOCK GRANT AMOUNTS. THIS

WOULD

- 11 BE SET AT \$5,000 FOR ELIGIBLE CITIES AND \$10,000
- 12 FOR ELIGIBLE COUNTIES. AT 31 CENTS PER RESIDENT,
- 13 YOU CAN UNDERSTAND THAT MANY LOCAL GOVERNMENTS OR
- 14 SMALL JURISDICTIONS ARE GETTING SUCH A SMALL
- 15 AMOUNT OF MONEY, THAT THEY'RE NOT ABLE TO
- 16 IMPLEMENT A VIABLE PROGRAM OF ANY TYPE. BY
- 17 ESTABLISHING A MINIMUM BLOCK GRANT, WE'LL BE ABLE
- 18 TO PROVIDE ENOUGH FUNDING SO THAT HOPEFULLY EVERY
- 19 JURISDICTION CAN ESTABLISH SOME TYPE OF A VIABLE
- 20 PROGRAM.
- 21 TO SERVE AS AN ILLUSTRATION, THERE
- 22 IS ABOUT 180 CITIES THAT WOULD BE ELIGIBLE FOR

THE

23	\$5,000 MINIMUM.	AND THROUGH	H THE PAST FO	UR GRANT
24	CYCLES ONLY 19	PERCENT OF TH	OSE PARTICULA	AR CITIES
25	HAVE COME IN ANI	D ACTUALLY AF	PPLIED FOR TH	EIR BLOCK

- 1 GRANTS. SO WE FEEL THIS WILL REALLY ENABLE US TO
- 2 REACH A LOT MORE PEOPLE IN THE STATE, AS WELL AS
- 3 PROVIDE ADDITIONAL PROGRAMS.
- 4 STAFF RECOMMENDATION THERE IS THAT
- 5 THE APPLICATION WILL ACTUALLY STATE THAT A
- 6 JURISDICTION WILL RECEIVE EITHER \$5,000 OR THE 31
- 7 CENTS PER RESIDENT, WHICHEVER IS GREATER.
- 8 AND THE THIRD RECOMMENDATION IS FOR
- 9 THE COMMITTEE TO APPROVE THIS PROCESS FOR THE
- 10 AWARD. STATUTE, AGAIN, IS VERY CLEAR ON HOW THE
- 11 ALLOCATION FORMULA IS DEVISED AND WHAT IS -- YOU
- 12 KNOW, WHAT ELIGIBLE AGENCIES ARE ENTITLED TO
- 13 RECEIVE. AND SO WE'RE JUST ASKING FOR DIRECTION
- 14 ON DIRECTING TO STAFF TO IMPLEMENT THE PROCESS
- 15 ANNUALLY AND CONTINUE ON THE GRANT PROGRAM.
- ARE THERE ANY QUESTIONS?
- 17 CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: QUESTIONS AT THIS
- 18 POINT?
- 19 MEMBER FRAZEE: WE WENT OVER THIS IN THE
- 20 BRIEFING YESTERDAY, AND I MAY HAVE LOST OVERNIGHT
- 21 THE EXPLANATION.
- 22 IN REGARD TO A SMALL JURISDICTION
- 23 THAT IS ELIGIBLE FOR \$5,000 PER YEAR FOR THREE
- 24 YEARS, IS IT NECESSARY FOR THEM TO APPLY DURING
- 25 THE FIRST YEAR IN ORDER TO BE ELIGIBLE FOR ALL

- 1 THREE YEARS?
- 2 MS. WILLD-WAGNER: THERE WILL BE AN
- 3 APPLICATION CYCLE EACH YEAR, SO THERE IS A PERIOD
- 4 OF TIME DURING THE FIRST YEAR THAT THEY COULD
- 5 APPLY FOR ALL THREE YEARS' FUNDS. IF THEY DON'T
- 6 CHOOSE TO APPLY THE FIRST YEAR, THEN THEY COULD
- 7 COME IN THE SECOND YEAR, BUT THEY WOULD ONLY
- 8 RECEIVE THE SECOND- AND THIRD-YEAR GRANT
- 9 ALLOCATIONS.
- 10 MEMBER FRAZEE: THEY COULDN'T GO BACK
- 11 RETROACTIVELY?
- 12 MS. WILLD-WAGNER: THAT'S CORRECT.
- 13 MEMBER FRAZEE: IN THE GRANT APPLICATION
- 14 ARE THEY REQUIRED TO SUBMIT A PROGRAM OR A PLAN OF
- 15 WHAT THEY INTEND?
- 16 MS. WILLD-WAGNER: A BASIC PLAN. THE
- 17 APPLICATION REALLY JUST CALLS FOR TYPE OF PROGRAM
- THEY'RE GOING TO IMPLEMENT, BE IT PUBLIC
- 19 EDUCATION, CURBSIDE COLLECTION, WHAT TYPE OF
- 20 PROGRAM. IT'S VERY, VERY BROAD AND IT CAN BE
- 21 CHANGED.
- 22 MEMBER FRAZEE: SO THAT'S REALLY ALL THEY
- 23 WOULD HAVE TO DO THE FIRST YEAR IN ORDER TO BE
- 24 ELIGIBLE FOR ALL THREE YEARS?
- 25 MS. WILLD-WAGNER: THAT'S CORRECT. AND

- 1 THEN THEY COULD SPEND THE MONEY BASICALLY WITHIN
- 2 THAT THREE-YEAR PERIOD.
- 3 MEMBER FRAZEE: AND THEY WOULD -- COULD
- 4 NOT SPEND SECOND-YEAR MONEY DURING THE FIRST YEAR?
- 5 MS. WILLD-WAGNER: THAT'S CORRECT.
- 6 CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: WE DO HAVE A SPEAKER
- 7 WHO'S ASKED TO ADDRESS THE COMMITTEE, CARY
- 8 BERTONCINI OF THE RCRC, ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES
- 9 JOINT POWERS AUTHORITY. MORNING.
- 10 MR. BERTONCINI: GOOD MORNING, CHAIRMAN,
- 11 COMMITTEE MEMBERS, AND STAFF. WE BROUGHT THIS UP
- 12 AT OUR JPA BOARD MEETING IN DECEMBER, AND THERE
- 13 WAS OVERWHELMING SUPPORT FOR ALL THREE CHANGES,
- 14 PARTICULARLY THE MINIMUM FUNDING LEVELS AND THE
- 15 THREE-YEAR TERM.
- 16 WITH THE THREE-YEAR TERM, THERE ARE
- 17 A FEW SPECIFIC PROBLEMS THAT SOME OF OUR RECYCLING
- 18 COORDINATORS AND SOLID WASTE PROFESSIONALS HAVE
- 19 HAD WITH THE OIL HAULING CONTRACTS. THEY CAN
- 20 NEGOTIATE A MUCH LOWER RATE IF THEY CAN PROMISE A
- 21 CONTRACT OVER A PERIOD OF TIME. WHEN THE GRANT IS
- 22 RUNNING OUT IN A YEAR, THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE
- 23 GRANT ARE THAT ALL SERVICES ARE RENDERED FOR
- 24 CONTRACTS THAT ARE AGREED UPON.
- 25 AND THE THREE-YEAR TERM WOULD GIVE

- 1 THEM MUCH MORE FLEXIBILITY FOR THIS. THE MINIMUM
- 2 LEVELS, I THINK, ARE PRETTY OBVIOUS. IT WOULD BE
- 3 A GREAT ADVANTAGE FOR MOST OF OUR RURAL COUNTIES,
- 4 ESPECIALLY THE VERY SMALL ONES. WE RECENTLY
- 5 WORKED WITH SIERRA COUNTY ON A HOUSEHOLD HAZARDOUS
- 6 WASTE COLLECTION EVENT, AND IN MANY CASES THE
- 7 COUNTIES AND THE CITIES ARE WORKING TOGETHER, AND
- 8 THOSE COUNTY FUNDS ARE THEN DISBURSED EVEN OVER A
- 9 GREATER NUMBER OF AREAS.
- 10 FOR EXAMPLE, SIERRA COUNTY RECEIVED,
- 11 I THINK, \$790. SO TO APPLY FOR A GRANT AND THEN
- 12 RECEIVE THAT AMOUNT AND STILL HAVE TO MEET THE
- 13 REPORTING REQUIREMENTS IS A BIT IMPRACTICAL FOR
- 14 THESE JURISDICTIONS.
- 15 BASICALLY THE PROPOSAL AS IT'S
- 16 WRITTEN PRETTY MUCH ECHOES WHAT WE HEARD AT OUR
- 17 JPA MEETING AND WHAT WE'VE BEEN HEARING FROM OUR
- 18 SOLID WASTE PEOPLE. AND WE WOULD LIKE TO STATE
- 19 STRONG SUPPORT FOR ALL 17 JPA COUNTIES, AS WELL
- AS
- 20 25 RCRC COUNTIES.
- 21 CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: ANY QUESTIONS FROM
- MR.
- 22 BERTONCINI? THANK YOU VERY MUCH.
- 23 I HAVE HAD THE CHANCE TO BRING THIS
- 24 UP WITH SEVERAL COUNTY OFFICIALS AND ALSO COUNTY

Please note: These transcripts are not individually reviewed and approved for accuracy.

25 SUPERVISORS ASSOCIATION STAFF. AND THERE WAS MILD

- 1 CONCERN ABOUT THE POSSIBILITY THAT SOME
- 2 JURISDICTIONS, LARGER JURISDICTIONS, MIGHT BE
- 3 AFRAID, MIGHT BE UPSET ABOUT ANY AMOUNT THAT THEY
- 4 MIGHT LOSE AS A RESULT OF FUNDING THE SMALLER
- 5 JURISDICTIONS. BUT IT TURNS OUT THAT STAFF HAS
- 6 FOUND A WAY TO KEEP THE LARGER JURISDICTIONS
- 7 WHOLE, AS WELL AS CREATE THIS FLOOR FUNDING FOR
- 8 THE SMALLER JURISDICTIONS. SO I CAN'T IMAGINE
- 9 THAT THERE WILL BE ANY PROBLEM WITH ANYBODY WITH
- 10 REGARDS TO THIS RECOMMENDATION.
- 11 I'M ASSUMING THAT'S THE CASE.
- 12 JUMPING OUT IN FRONT OF MY FELLOW COMMITTEE
- 13 MEMBERS, BUT IN TERMS OF LOCAL GOVERNMENTS,
- 14 ANYWAY, I HAVEN'T HEARD ANYTHING THAT'S A PROBLEM.
- 15 I THINK THAT THE FIRST TWO
- 16 RECOMMENDATIONS ARE GOOD. I THINK THE STREAM-
- 17 LINING OF EXTENDING THE GRANT TERM FROM ONE TO
- 18 THREE YEARS CREATES A LEVEL OF CERTAINTY AND
- ABILITY TO ACT WITH A LITTLE MORE MONEY, PERHAPS
- 20 PUT THE MONEY TOGETHER TO DO SOME MORE SIGNIFICANT
- 21 THINGS BY THE LOCAL JURISDICTIONS. I ALSO THINK
- 22 THAT THE MINIMUM GRANT CONCEPT IS A GOOD IDEA.
- 23 THE ONLY ONE THAT THERE'S A
- 24 POTENTIAL PROBLEM WITH, I THINK, IS A PROCESS
- 25 WHICH ESSENTIALLY DELEGATES THE DECISION PROCESS

- 1 FROM THE COMMITTEE AND BOARD TO THE STAFF. AND
- 2 EVEN THOUGH IT IS IN STATUTE AND IT'S PRETTY WELL
- 3 PROSCRIBED FOR US, I THINK FROM THE STANDPOINT OF
- 4 BOARD MEMBERS BEING ACTIVELY INFORMED OF THE WHOLE
- 5 PICTURE OF WHAT'S GOING ON WITH THE OIL MONEY AND
- 6 ALSO HAVING A PUBLIC PROCESS SO WE CAN GET FEED-
- 7 BACK FROM THE FOLKS THAT ARE AFFECTED BY THE
- 8 PROGRAM, THE USERS, THE CUSTOMERS, IF YOU WILL, I
- 9 KNOW THAT CAN HAPPEN AT THE STAFF LEVEL, BUT I
- 10 THINK FROM A BOARD PERSPECTIVE OF BOARD MEMBERS
- 11 WHO RECEIVE INPUT IN THE PUBLIC PROCESS, I THINK
- 12 IT'S IMPORTANT TO CONTINUE THAT PROCESS.
- for a couple reasons, I'm not
- 14 PREPARED TO SUGGEST THAT WE RECOMMEND OUTRIGHT
- 15 TURNING THAT DOWN TODAY. ONE OF THEM IS THERE'S A
- 16 LITTLE BIT OF A COMMITTEE JURISDICTION QUESTION
- 17 BECAUSE THE GRANT ALLOCATIONS ARE ACTUALLY
- 18 RECOMMENDED AT THE ADMIN COMMITTEE. AND SO I
- 19 THINK PROBABLY OTHER BOARD MEMBERS WHO ARE ON THAT
- 20 COMMITTEE MIGHT HAVE AN INTEREST OR THE CHAIR OF
- 21 THAT COMMITTEE MIGHT HAVE AN INTEREST. BEFORE WE
- 22 PRECLUDE OR JUMP IN FRONT AND MAKE A RECOMMENDA-
- 23 TION TO THE BOARD, WE MIGHT WANT TO HOLD OFF ON
- 24 THAT ONE.
- 25 AND ALSO, I THINK THAT THERE'S SOME

- 1 OUESTIONS ABOUT EXACTLY HOW WE DO THAT BECAUSE I
- 2 DO THINK I'M IN FAVOR OF THE STREAMLINING STAFF'S
- 3 ATTEMPTING TO ACHIEVE, SO I'M LOOKING FOR A
- 4 BALANCE BETWEEN BOARD INVOLVEMENT AND MAKING THIS
- 5 AS SIMPLE AS POSSIBLE. AND THERE'S A QUESTION OF
- 6 HOW WE HANDLE THE OFF YEARS BETWEEN -- DURING THE
- 7 THREE-YEAR CYCLE, THE TWO YEARS IN BETWEEN, ABOUT
- 8 EXACTLY IN WHAT FORM AGENDA ITEMS WOULD TAKE AND
- 9 HOW WE CAN MINIMIZE THE AMOUNT OF PAPERWORK AND
- 10 STAFF TIME INVOLVED IN GETTING THINGS BEFORE THE
- 11 COMMITTEE AND UPDATING THE COMMITTEE AND HAVING US
- 12 AND THE BOARD INVOLVED IN THE DECISION PROCESS.
- SO I WOULD RECOMMEND THAT WE APPROVE
- 14 STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS 1 AND 2 AND RECOMMEND THOSE
- 15 TO THE BOARD AND FORWARD NO. 3 TO THE BOARD AT
- 16 THIS TIME WITHOUT RECOMMENDATION. AND THEN WE CAN
- 17 CONSULT WITH THE OTHER BOARD MEMBERS BETWEEN NOW
- 18 AND THE BOARD MEETING ON HOW TO PROCEED WITH ITEM
- 19 3. THAT WOULD BE MY RECOMMENDATION.
- 20 MEMBER GOTCH: I'LL -- SO MOVED.
- 21 MEMBER FRAZEE: YES, SECOND.
- 22 CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: MOVED AND SECONDED.
- 23 SUBSTITUTE THE PRIOR ROLL CALL. MOTION CARRIES
- 24 THREE ZERO. THANKS FOR YOUR TIME.
- 25 AND THE FINAL REGULAR AGENDA ITEM IS

- 1 PRESENTATION OF RESULTS OF THE 1996 SCHOOL
- 2 DISTRICT WASTE REDUCTION SURVEY REPORT.
- 3 MS. VAN KEKERIX: JIM CROPPER IS GOING TO
- 4 BE MAKING THE PRESENTATION ON THE LATEST OF THE
- 5 SCHOOL SURVEYS AND THE RESULTS.
- 6 CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: GUY'S BEEN ALL OVER
- 7 THE NEWS.
- 8 MR. CROPPER: INFAMY. INFAMOUS. GOOD
- 9 MORNING, MR. CHAIRMAN, COMMITTEE MEMBERS. I'M JIM
- 10 CROPPER OF THE PUBLIC DIVERSION ASSISTANCE
- 11 SECTION, AND I'LL BE PRESENTING THE AGENDA ITEM ON
- 12 THE RESULTS OF THE 1996 SCHOOL DISTRICT WASTE
- 13 REDUCTION SURVEY.
- 14 FOR A LITTLE BIT OF BACKGROUND, IN
- 15 CALIFORNIA THERE ARE 996 SCHOOL DISTRICTS AND
- 16 ABOUT 8,000 PUBLIC SCHOOLS AND ABOUT FIVE AND A
- 17 HALF MILLION STUDENTS GENERATING ABOUT HALF A
- 18 MILLION TONS OF SOLID WASTE PER YEAR OR ABOUT ONE
- 19 PERCENT OF THE STATE'S SOLID WASTE.
- 20 PUBLIC RESOURCES CODE SECTION 42621
- 21 REQUIRES THE BOARD TO DEVELOP AND IMPLEMENT SOURCE
- 22 REDUCTION AND RECYCLING PROGRAMS FOR THE SCHOOL
- 23 DISTRICTS. AND LET ME EMPHASIZE IT'S NOT FOR

THE

24 SCHOOLS; IT'S FOR SCHOOL DISTRICTS. ONE ELEMENT

Please note: These transcripts are not individually reviewed and approved for accuracy.

25 REQUIRED BY LAW IN DEVELOPING RECYCLING PROGRAMS

- 1 IS TO SURVEY WHICH DISTRICTS ALREADY HAVE SOURCE
- 2 REDUCTION AND RECYCLING PROGRAMS AND WHICH
- 3 DISTRICTS NEED THOSE PROGRAMS.
- 4 SO ON APRIL 1ST OF '96, THE 1996
- 5 WASTE REDUCTION QUESTIONNAIRE WAS MAILED TO ALL
- 6 THE SCHOOL DISTRICT DIVERSION CONTACTS, AND THEY
- 7 WERE ASKED TO COMPLETE THE QUESTIONNAIRE AND
- 8 RETURN IT BY MAY 1ST OF 1996. AND THE QUESTION-
- 9 NAIRE ASKED TEN QUESTIONS. WE TRIED TO KEEP IT AS
- 10 SIMPLE AS POSSIBLE.
- 11 AND THE QUESTIONS ASKED ASKED THEM
- 12 TO DETERMINE IF THEY HAD A WASTE PREVENTION
- 13 POLICY, IF THE DISTRICT HAD A POLICY TO PURCHASE
- 14 RECYCLED-CONTENT PRODUCTS, WHAT MATERIALS THEY
- 15 WERE RECYCLING, HOW THE DISTRICT HANDLES THEIR
- 16 ORGANICS LIKE FOOD WASTE OR GRASS, WHO COLLECTS
- 17 THE RECYCLABLES, WHAT BARRIERS THEY'VE ENCOUNTERED
- 18 IMPLEMENTING RECYCLING PROGRAMS, AND IF THEY WOULD
- 19 LIKE A SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT CURRICULUM THAT'S
- 20 PROVIDED BY ANOTHER SECTION, AND WHO IS THE
- 21 CORRECT PERSON RESPONSIBLE FOR THEIR DIVERSION
- 22 PROGRAM SO WE WOULD BE ABLE TO MAIL FUTURE
- 23 INFORMATION TO THEM.
- OF THE 996 SCHOOL DISTRICTS, 581 OR
- 25 58 PERCENT OF THE SCHOOL DISTRICTS COMPLETED THE

- 1 SURVEY EITHER BY RESPONDING TO THE QUESTIONS OVER
- 2 THE TELEPHONE OR BY COMPLETING THE SURVEY AND
- 3 RETURNING IT BY MAIL.
- 4 WE COMPILED THE RESULTS AND THEN
- 5 PROVIDED THEM BACK TO THE SCHOOL DISTRICTS WITH A
- 6 TRANSMITTAL LETTER EXPLAINING THE TABLES AND ASKED
- 7 IF THEY WOULD LIKE ASSISTANCE. THE RESULTS
- 8 CONSISTED OF THREE TABLES, WHICH ARE THE THREE
- 9 APPENDICES, AND CONTAIN INFORMATION ON DIVERSION
- 10 CONTACTS, INFORMATION SUCH AS WHAT SCHOOL DISTRICT
- 11 THEY WERE ASSOCIATED WITH, WHAT THEIR PHONE NUMBER
- 12 WAS, WHAT COUNTY THEY WERE IN.
- AND THEN ALSO THE APPENDICES
- 14 INCLUDED WHAT THEY RECYCLE SO THAT IF ONE SCHOOL
- 15 DISTRICT WAS RECYCLING POLYSTYRENE, ANOTHER ONE
- 16 COULD ASK THEM QUESTIONS ABOUT WHO THEY WERE
- 17 USING, WHAT RECYCLER THEY WERE USING, OR HOW THEY
- 18 GO ABOUT COLLECTING THE POLYSTYRENE, OR WHATEVER
- 19 OUESTIONS THEY MIGHT HAVE INSTEAD OF CONTACTING
- 20 US.
- 21 ALSO, ONE OF THE APPENDICES CONTAINS
- 22 BARRIERS THAT THEY HAVE ENCOUNTERED IN SETTING UP
- 23 A RECYCLING PROGRAM. SOME OF THE RESULTS THAT WE
- 24 OBTAINED SHOWED THAT OF THOSE RESPONDING, ABOUT
- 25 275 OR 47 PERCENT OF THE SCHOOL DISTRICTS THAT

- 1 RETURNED THE QUESTIONNAIRE TO US SAID THAT THEY
- 2 HAVE A WASTE PREVENTION PLAN OR POLICY. 88 OR 9
- 3 PERCENT OF THE SCHOOL DISTRICTS THAT RETURNED THE
- 4 SURVEY INDICATED THAT THEY HAVE A PURCHASING
- 5 POLICY OF RECYCLED-CONTENT PRODUCTS; HOWEVER, IN
- 6 SOME OF THE INSTANCES THAT I SPOKE TO THEM, MANY
- 7 OF THEM SAID IF -- WE USUALLY LOOK TO SEE IF THE
- 8 PRODUCT IS JUST CHEAPER, NOT NECESSARILY IF IT

HAS

- 9 RECYCLED-CONTENT.
- 10 207 OR 21 PERCENT OF THE SCHOOL
- 11 DISTRICTS RESPONDED THAT THEY COORDINATE
- 12 DISTRICTWIDE RECYCLING ACTIVITIES. AND KIND OF

ON

- 13 THE NEGATIVE SIDE, HALF OF ALL THE SCHOOL
- 14 DISTRICTS RESPONDING SAID THEY HAD NO RECYCLING
- 15 PROGRAM AT ALL, BUT TO UNDERSTAND THAT MANY OF

THE

- 16 SCHOOL DISTRICTS MAY HAVE LESS THAN A HUNDRED
- 17 STUDENTS. AND A FOURTH OF THE VERY LARGE SCHOOL
- 18 DISTRICTS, GREATER THAN 10,000 STUDENTS, SAID

THAT

- 19 THEY HAVE NO RECYCLING PROGRAM AT ALL.
- 20 SO HOW DO WE PLAN TO USE THIS
- 21 INFORMATION? WE'VE PROVIDED THE APPENDICES BACK

22	TO THE	SCHOOL	DISTRICTS	AND	PLAN	ON	PROVIDI	1G
THEM								
23	TO THE	COUNTY	GOVERNMENT	C OFF	TICIAL	S.	AND WE	
24 25			NFORMATION					THAT

- 1 REQUESTS AT WORKSHOPS.
- 2 AND ALSO, BASED ON THE RESULTS,
- 3 WE'RE DEVELOPING ADDITIONAL MATERIALS THAT CAN BE
- 4 USED BY SCHOOL DISTRICTS TO SET UP RECYCLING
- 5 PROGRAMS. AND ON A PERIODIC BASIS WE'RE GOING TO
- 6 MAIL INFORMATION TO THE SCHOOL DISTRICT DIVERSION
- 7 CONTACTS REGARDING WASTE REDUCTIONS. AND THEN
- 8 ALSO WE'LL BE ABLE TO USE THIS INFORMATION, THESE
- 9 TABLES, AS A BASELINE FOR FUTURE YEARS SO THAT WE
- 10 CAN DETERMINE HOW THEY'RE DOING.
- 11 AND I GUESS KIND OF FOR YOUR
- 12 INFORMATION, WHAT WE'RE CURRENTLY DOING WITH THIS
- 13 TO ASSIST THE SCHOOL DISTRICTS IS WE PROVIDE AN
- 14 ASSISTANCE PACKAGE, A BOOKLET ON HOW TO SET UP A
- 15 PROGRAM, WHAT SOME OF THE RESOURCES ARE AVAILABLE,
- 16 WHO THE LOCAL RECYCLING CONTACT IS, AND ALSO
- 17 FUNDING, SOME FUNDING SOURCES, HOW THEY CAN GET
- 18 GRANTS, AND ALL THE DIFFERENT GRANTS THAT ARE
- 19 AVAILABLE TO THEM.
- 20 WE'RE ALSO WORKING ON A WORKSHOP
- 21 WITH NORCAL IN SAN BERNARDING FOR EARLY MARCH TO
- 22 TRAIN SCHOOL DIVERSION PERSONNEL ON HOW TO SET UP
- 23 A RECYCLING PROGRAM. AND WE EXPECT ABOUT A
- 24 HUNDRED PEOPLE TO ATTEND. AND WE'RE ALSO PLANNING
- 25 ON HAVING A BOOTH AT THE CALIFORNIA ASSOCIATION OF

- 1 SCHOOL BUSINESS OFFICIALS IN APRIL TO PROMOTE OUR
- 2 ASSISTANCE PROGRAM, AND ALSO WE CAN PROVIDE THE
- 3 RESULTS OF THE SURVEY.
- 4 AND ALSO, JUST IN GENERAL, WHEN
- 5 WE'RE ASKED TO PROVIDE HANDS-ON ASSISTANCE, WE'LL
- 6 GO OUT TO SOME OF THE SCHOOL DISTRICTS OR JUST TRY
- 7 AND ANSWER THE QUESTIONS OVER THE PHONE.
- 8 AND WE'VE PROVIDED YOU WITH A COPY
- 9 OF THE REPORT, AND I'D BE HAPPY TO ANSWER ANY
- 10 QUESTIONS THAT YOU MIGHT HAVE.
- 11 CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: QUESTIONS? I ASKED A
- 12 LOT OF THEM IN THE BRIEFING. IT'S, I THINK, AN
- 13 EXCELLENT REPORT. WE TALKED A LITTLE BIT ABOUT
- 14 SOME OF THE ISSUES IN TERMS OF QUALIFYING IT A
- 15 LITTLE BIT. FOR EXAMPLE, I THINK IN A LOT OF
- 16 DISTRICTS, YOU HAVE INDIVIDUAL SCHOOLS THAT ARE
- 17 ACTIVELY ENGAGED IN DIVERSION ACTIVITIES THAT MAY
- 18 NOT BE COORDINATED THROUGH THE DISTRICT. BUT ON
- 19 THE OTHER HAND, I DON'T KNOW THAT THERE'S ANY
- 20 OTHER WAY. WE CERTAINLY CAN'T SURVEY EVERY SCHOOL
- 21 IN THE STATE. SO I THINK THIS IS A GOOD EFFORT.
- 22 IF ANYTHING, THE LEVEL OF ACTIVITY IS PROBABLY
- 23 HIGHER THAN AS IDENTIFIED HERE, I WOULD THINK.
- 24 I'M AWARE PERSONALLY OF EXAMPLES
- 25 WHERE THERE'S INDIVIDUAL SCHOOL ACTIVITIES THAT

- 1 AREN'T FROM THE TOP DOWN. THEY'RE HAPPENING
- 2 BECAUSE THE KIDS OR THE TEACHERS OR THE PARENTS
- 3 SAID LET'S DO SOMETHING. SO WE WILL BE MAKING
- 4 THIS AVAILABLE TO THE SCHOOL DISTRICTS AS PART OF
- 5 OUR ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS.
- ANY OTHER COMMENTS OR QUESTIONS?
- 7 MEMBER FRAZEE: JUST A COMMENT ON YOUR
- 8 SUGGESTION THAT THERE ARE ACTIVITIES TAKING PLACE
- 9 THAT MAY NOT GET REPORTED. IN OUR BRIEFING
- 10 DISCUSSION YESTERDAY, I WAS TELLING STAFF ABOUT A
- 11 UNIQUE SITUATION THAT EXISTS IN NORTH SAN DIEGO
- 12 COUNTY WHERE THE SAME FAMILY THAT HAVE A NUMBER OF
- 13 THE WASTE HAULING FRANCHISES ARE ALSO IN THE DAIRY
- 14 BUSINESS AND PROVIDE INSTITUTIONAL MILK AND OTHER
- 15 DRINKS.
- 16 SO THEY HAVE A PROGRAM PICKING UP
- 17 ALL OF THE STYROFOAM TRAYS AND CONTAINERS AND ALL
- 18 THE MILK CARTONS FROM THE SCHOOLS. WHEN THEY MAKE
- 19 THAT DELIVERY, THEN IT'S IMMEDIATELY BACK TO THE
- 20 WASTE HAULER PART OF THE FAMILY WHERE IT'S
- 21 MARKETED. SO IT'S A GOOD CONNECTION WHERE I THINK
- 22 TYPICALLY THOSE ARE SPLIT, AND THERE'S NOT ANY
- 23 CONVERSATION GOES ON BETWEEN THE TWO. IT'S KIND
- OF A MODEL OF WHAT CAN BE DONE.
- 25 CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: IN A LOT OF SCHOOLS,

- 1 YOU KNOW, THE PAPER DRIVE OR THE RELATIONSHIP -- I
- 2 KNOW THAT IN SACRAMENTO AREA THERE'S SOME PAPER
- 3 DEALERS WHO HAVE APPROACHED THE SITE SUPPORT
- 4 COMMITTEE OR WHATEVER OR THE PTA, THE SCHOOL SITE
- 5 COUNCIL, TO HELP THEM FUND RAISE, WITH THE
- 6 AGREEMENT OF THE SCHOOL, THE PRINCIPAL, YOU KNOW,
- 7 TO PUT LIKE A BIN ON CAMPUS OR SOMETHING FOR
- 8 RECYCLING. AND SO THERE'S ALL KINDS OF
- 9 DIFFERENT --
- 10 I THINK WHAT YOU'RE POINTING OUT,
- 11 THAT THERE'S PRIVATE SECTOR ORIGINATED ACTIVITIES,
- 12 AND THIS IS ANOTHER EXAMPLE, THAT AGAIN MAY NOT BE
- 13 OFFICIALLY A SCHOOL DISTRICT PROGRAM, MAY JUST
- 14 SIMPLY BE HAPPENING AS A RESULT OF BUSINESS
- 15 RELATIONSHIPS AND PROSPECTING BY BUSINESSES THAT
- 16 ARE INTERESTED IN WORKING WITH INDIVIDUAL SCHOOLS
- 17 OR SOMETIMES THE PARENT ASSOCIATION OR WHO KNOWS.
- 18 NONETHELESS, I MEAN I THINK THE GOOD
- 19 NEWS IS THAT THIS SURVEY SHOWS SIGNIFICANT
- 20 ACTIVITY, AND IT PROBABLY DOESN'T HAVE ALL THE
- 21 ACTIVITY IN IT. SO GOOD WORK. AND I DON'T
- 22 BELIEVE THIS REQUIRES US TO ACT.
- 23 MEMBER GOTCH: I ALSO WANTED TO THANK YOU
- 24 FOR THE SURVEY, AND I'M GLAD TO HEAR THAT YOU DID
- 25 FOLLOW THROUGH AND CALL UP THE SCHOOLS THAT YOU

1	DIDN'T HEAR FROM OR MANY OF THEM. BUT ALSO HAPPY
2	TO SEE THAT STAFF HAD FOLLOWED THROUGH WITH THE
3	RECOMMENDATIONS THAT ARE LISTED ON PAGE 10 AND 11
4	OF THE ITEM. VERY GOOD RECOMMENDATIONS. THANKS A
5	LOT.
6	MR. CROPPER: THANK YOU.
7	CHAIRMAN CHESBRO: OKAY. THANKS. AND I
8	BELIEVE THAT COMPLETES OUR BUSINESS UNLESS ANYONE
9	WANTS TO BRING ANYTHING ELSE TO MY ATTENTION.
10	THANKS AND GOOD DAY.
11	
12	(END OF PROCEEDINGS AT 11:30 A.M.)
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	